DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 037 SO 019 242

AUTHOR	Rutkowski, Edward, Ed.
TITLE	Papers and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society (7th, Chicago, Illinois, October 27-28, 1972).
INSTITUTION	Midwest History of Education Society, Cedar Falls, IA.
PUB DATE	73
NOTE	175p.; For related documents, see SO 019 243-257.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society; v1 1973
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; Demonstrations (Civil); Educational Attitudes; Educational Development; Educational Environment; *Educational History; Educational Philosophy; Extension Education; Multilingualism; Progressive Education; Public Schools; Religious Education; *Teachers; Vocational Education; Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS	Alcott (Bronson); *Canada; Marcuse (Herbert)

ABSTRACT

The first journal publication of the Midwest History of Education Society contains papers presented at its 1972 annual meeting and three papers on Canadian education. "University Extension in the United States, 1885-1915" (G. M. Woytanowitz) defines the U.S. origins of the university extension as an adult education agency. "She Could Always Teach" (K. H. Kamin) examines the historical impact of this attitude on women, the evolution of the teaching profession, and the social implications for women who did teach. "The Revolutions of 1968: A Neo-Hegelian View" (R. E. Mason) considers whether the Neo-Hegelian perspective developed by Herbert Marcuse can be attributed to the student unrest of 1964-1971 in the United States, France, and Germany. "A Critique of Lawrence Cremin's American Education: The Colonial Experience 1607-1783 and Its Adaptability In History of American Education Courses" (S. S. Cohen) reviews the book's organization and themes and discusses its use as a textbook. "Amos Bronson Alcott: Transcendental Educator" (D. B. Ripley) reviews the teaching innovations and educational philosophy introduced by Alcott in Connecticut Schools. These innovations included the physical design of the classroom, the choice of textbooks and library books, and the introduction of physical education. "Education and Industrial Skills: Changing Conceptions of the Role of Public Schooling, 1865--1900" (B. E. McClellan) discusses the introduction of manual training in the U.S. educational system. The first paper on Canadian education, "John Strachan: A Controversial Figure" (C. H. Gross), is a biographical study of the first Anglican Bishop of Toronto who promoted religious instruction in schools, especially at the university level. "American Influence on Progressive Education in Canada" (R. S. Patterson) discusses how progressive educational reform measures were introduced to Canadian educators. "Education and Multilingualism in Manitoba" (K. Wilson) discusses the effects of the Laurier-Greenway Compromise's bilingual clause and the establishment of the 1967 Public Schools Act. The program and business meeting's minutes are included. (DJC)

ED298037

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

PAPERS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1972 ANNUAL MEETING

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
EDWARD
RUTKOWSKI
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

SO019242

College of Education
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

JOURNAL OF THE MIDWEST HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

PAPERS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1972 ANNUAL MEETING

College of Education
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Distributed and Published for the Society by the

College of Education

University of Northern Iowa

Cedar Falls, Iowa

Copyright 1973 by the Midwest History

of Education Society

Edited by

Edward Rutkowski, University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Copies of this publication are distributed to the members of the Midwest History of Education Society as an official record of the annual meeting.

EDITOR'S FORWARD

This is the first publication of the Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society. The major purpose of the journal is to publish the papers and proceedings of our annual meetings. The papers are on a variety of topics in the history of education. In some cases, the authors chose to revise their papers slightly for inclusion in this journal. The papers are presented as the author prepared them with only minimal modifications.

In this our inaugural issue, it would be only fitting to thank all of the people and institutions who made contributions in establishing and supporting the society. They are so numerous that it would be difficult to thank them all. However, the editor would like to recognize Gerald Gutek and Kenneth Beasley who organized our first meeting in the spring of 1966, also the faculty and staff of the College of Education of Loyola University, Chicago who have been so generous with their time and facilities. They have played a vital role in making the society a success and rewarding experience for us all.

For this publication, the editor would like to thank the University of Northern Iowa for its help in carrying out this project. My special thanks to Vice President James G. Martin for encouragement and financial assistance and the staff of the College of Education without whom we could not have published a journal for the society.

In this first issue, with the papers and proceedings of the society the editor has included a Editor's Supplement on the theme Canadian Education. It is hoped that in future issues we will again be able to publish many of the excellent papers of past meetings under similar themes of interest along with the presentations of each current annual meeting.

Edward Rutkowski
Editor

CONTENTS

PART I

PAPERS

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION IN THE UNITED STATES, 1885-1915
by George M. Woytanowitz 1

SHE COULD ALWAYS TEACH by Kay Hodes Kamin . . . 22

THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1968——A NEO-HEGELIAN VIEW
by Robert E. Mason 40

A CRITIQUE OF LAWRENCE CREMIN'S
AMERICAN EDUCATION: THE COLONIAL EXPERIENCE
1607-1783, AND ITS ADAPTABILITY IN HISTORY OF
AMERICAN EDUCATION COURSES
by Sheldon S. Cohen 54

AMOS BRONSON ALCOTT: TRANSCENDENTAL EDUCATOR
by David B. Ripley 62

EDUCATION AND INDUSTRIAL SKILLS: CHANGING
CONCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE OF PUBLIC SCHOOLING,
1965-1900 by B. Edward McClellan 80

CANADIAN EDUCATION
An Editor's Supplement

FORWARD AND INTRODUCTION by the Editor 95

JOHN STRACHAN, A CONTROVERSIAL FIGURE
by Carl H. Gross 96

AMERICAN INFLUENCE ON PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION
IN CANADA by Robert S. Patterson 122

EDUCATION AND MULTILINGUALISM IN MANITOBA by Keith Wilson 144

PART II

THE OFFICIAL PROGRAM OF THE 1972 ANNUAL MEETING 165

THE BUSINESS MEETING AND ELECTIONS OF NEW OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY 168

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION IN THE UNITED STATES 1885-1915

by
George M. Woytanowitz
Assistant Professor of Education
Indiana State University

Historians of American education have often commented on the numerous adult education agencies which Americans created or patronized. From colonial evening schools through the Lyceums, Chatauquas, lecture circuits, farmer's institutes, and great books discussion groups, adult Americans have expressed a desire to continue learning into maturity. In spite of its pervasiveness and of a relationship to social mobility often vaguely attributed to it, historians have been remiss in probing the nature and role of adult education.[1] In this paper I will examine the American origins of university extension, for eighty years a popular, albeit an ill-defined adult education agency.

Despite the efforts of Herbert Baxter Adams to find American antecedents, university extension, as understood in the years from 1885 to 1915, was an English import, borrowed with the cooperation of English extension leaders. Thus, an understanding of American extension depends on a knowledge of its English heritage.

English university extension began in 1867 when the members of a women's club requested James Stuart, fellow in Trinity College, Cambridge, to deliver a series of lectures. The popularity of these lectures led Stuart to develop a program for off-campus courses consisting of six or twelve lectures, paper work, discussions, readings and an examination. By 1875 Cambridge professors and fellows had lectured to 17,000 people and the extension idea spread to Oxford and London. By 1889 teachers from these three centers spoke to 15,000 people annually throughout England. In addition to these lecture courses the universities sponsored on-campus extension summer sessions[1] and, despite opposition, offered university credit for extension classes. By 1890 English university extension was a highly-organized system of local centers and university offices serving as a bridge between the traditionally elitist universities and the middle classes. Although there is little doubt that university extension's appearance initially in England may be attributed to a set of unique social and educational phenomena, among them, the peculiar position and history of the two universities, the surplus of potential university instructors, the late nineteenth century social structure, and the government's failure to provide secondary education; there is equally little doubt that none of the basic elements of university extension: the lecturer, the methodology, the bureaucratic structure, and the type of student attracted, was peculiar to England. By 1890 educators on the Continent, in Australia, and in the United States attempted university extension on the English model.[2]

When it arrived in the U.S. in the 1880's, university extension was merely the latest in a series of ventures in schooling for the mature. A lyceum fever had swept the country in the 1830's and thousands of Americans had flocked to lectures on scholarly, popular, and entertaining topics.[3]. The most prominent post-Civil War adult education center was Chautauqua with its summer school, lectures, and correspondence classes in all parts of the country. Combining the popularization of knowledge with a non-denominational pietistic approach, Bishop John Vincent created a mighty engine of adult education which drew accolades from both farmers and professors.[4] The lecturers who appeared at lyceums and the university professors who spoke from Chautauqua platforms had unwittingly prepared American soil for the planting of the seed of English university extension.

Herbert Baxter Adams, Professor of History at the Johns Hopkins University, introduced English university extension to Americans. In 1885 he inserted a brief description of the English system in the annual report of the Commissioner of Education. Two years later he called upon the members of the American Library

Association to use their facilities as foci of extension activity, centers where "the best forces in the community" could lead a great crusade for mass culture. In the audience was J. N. Larned, head librarian at Buffalo, New York, who returned home and laid plans for an extension course in conjunction with the library. Larned requested Adams to recommend a lecturer, and Adams selected Edward Bemis, a former doctoral student who had been unsuccessful in locating a university position. During the winter of 1888 Bemis' twelve lectures on "Economic Questions of the Day" attracted an audience of women, union leaders, workers, and business and professional men. Larned's careful planning, the popularity of the topic, and the continual presence of the lecturer in the community as a catalyst for further discussion made the course a success, and Bemis later repeated it in Ohio and Missouri.[5]

As Bemis' course in Buffalo ended, Bishop Vincent of Chautauqua appointed Richard T. Ely, Frederick Starr, William Rainey Harper, and Adams as a committee to draw up an extension program for Chautauqua. The committee's prospectus which appeared in September, 1888 adopted the elements of English university extension with Chautauqua headquarters filling the role which the universities filled in England and with local centers to be created out of YMCA's, libraries, and other preexisting institutes. The committee termed its proposal a "voluntary itinerant university." Although Chautauqua offered a few courses, university extension never became a significant aspect of its program as it operated in the shadow of the more popular correspondence courses, reading circles, and summer meetings.[6]

A third New York State-based extension agency was the University and School Extension Society, formed in 1888 by Brooklyn Teachers. This society provided advanced teacher training through home study, class work, lectures, travelling libraries, and examinations, all of which led to a certificate. Professors from Yale, Princeton, and Columbia supervised the work, and the presidents of these universities vowed their support. The appearance of competition within the state drew the attention of Chautauqua extension organizers, and George Vincent visited Brooklyn to investigate. He reported that the new organization was "not at all familiar with the English University extension work and just pushed up the name as a good descriptive title." Vincent accurately predicted that the organization would "not achieve remarkable success," and 1890 its role was small.[7]

Melvil Dewey, librarian of the New York State Library in Albany, is the central figure in the fourth early extension agency in New York. After an English visit to study extension and correspondence with Adams, Dewey led the teachers of New York in a campaign which culminated in legislative appropriations for a state office which scheduled extension courses, examined students and provided travelling libraries and stereopticon shows. The office worked in alliance with local groups which initiated courses and contacted and paid the lecturer. With mixed successes and failures this arrangement prevailed well into the 1890's.[8]

By 1890 the early efforts to transplant English university extension were sufficiently notorious to draw the attention of American educational leaders. As expressed through convention oratory and the educational press, the reaction was a cautious one. They worried over the adaptibility of English methods as well as the possibilities of chicanery and a return to the educational level of the lyceum. Some feared that work that bore no resemblance to university study would have the name university study would have the name university attached to it.[9] Before educational leaders would embrace extension, a demonstration that it could attract large numbers over a large area to high quality courses for several years was necessary.

In the early 1890's Americans formed three university extensions agencies which seemed, for a time, to root English style university extension in American soil. The first of these was the Philadelphia Society for the Extension of University Teaching. A group of socially and economically prominent Philadelphia businessmen formed the Philadelphia Society after an address on university extension by William Pepper, Provost of the University of Pennsylvania. They sent its secretary, George Henderson, to England to observe extension work first hand, and won pledges of cooperation from the faculties of several eastern Pennsylvania colleges. To initiate its course work in the fall of 1890 the Society brought to Philadelphia Richard G. Moulton, the most popular extension lecturer in England. Local centers sprouted in the Philadelphia area, most of them developing out of such groups as St. Timothy's Workingmen's Club, the New Century Club, the Wagner Institute, and the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations. Impressed by the zeal Americans showed for extension classes Moulton wrote Adams, "every day--afternoon--and night has long been appropriated" for lecturing. In the flush of its early success, the Society changed its name to the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, appointed University of Pennsylvania political scientist, Edmund J. James its president, and began publication of a monthly house organ.[10] Its leadership soon came to view the Society as the clearinghouse for extension information in the United States: a local operator, national coordinator, and international representative of university extension.

A second important extension agency of the early 1890's was the University of Wisconsin. With support from President Thomas C. Chamberlain and with a solid core of Adams-trained faculty enthusiasts such as Richard Ely, Frederick Speirs, Frederick Jackson Turner, and Lyman P. Powell, the university began extension on the English model in 1891. In that first year for a fee of $60 plus expenses the faculty presented fifty-three, six lecture courses to an audience of over 7,500 citizens. Despite Turner's report that extension classes were "astonishingly popular," Wisconsin's extension program soon fell prey to a shortage of willing lectures. Many faculty members were apathetic, some openly hostile, and even such devotees as Turner confessed: "...the work is too wearing with my class work in the university and I shall not do any of it another year if I can possibly escape. I must have some time for **intension**." With the cooling of faculty ardor and with the departure of President Chamberlain, the extension program at Wisconsin slipped into inactivity after two years.[11]

A second extension center in the Midwest was the extension division of William Rainey Harper and John D. Rockefeller's University of Chicago. The university's director of extension supervised five departments, among them lecture study, the name given to English-style extension. A student could earn up to half the credit for a Bachelor's degree and one-third of the credit for an advanced degree through the extension division. The university did not face the problem of insufficient faculty for Harper sought to bring to Chicago some of the leading extension people in both England and the United States. He successfully recruited Richard Moulton, Edward Bemis, and George Henderson, and almost convinced Herbert Baxter Adams and Melville Dewey to come to the Midway. But as the Chicago division moved forcefully to establish local centers throughout the Midwest, its director grappled with the problem of the relationship of extension faculty to the university. In general even the most ardent disciple of extension lecturing sought more on-campus teaching. Moulton fought for a chair in literature, informing Harper that "as time goes on more and more of my work ought to be in the university proper." Moulton resented the fact that as an extension lecturer he felt "as much shut out of the social life of the university as if I were an agent abroad." Edward Bemis complained: "I am getting tired, as I feared I would, of so much travel in connection with University Extension." He also sought more "inside work" only to meet a hostile reception from his department chairman, J. Lawrence Laughlin. Weakened, but not gravely wounded by such disputes, the extension program at the University of Chicago remained the Midwest's most viable throughout the 1890's.[12]

By the end of 1891 English-style university extension had sprouted in all parts of the United States. In addition to the major agencies in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Wisconsin, there were other active centers. Brown University developed an inexpensive state-wide lecture program, while city extension societies appeared in Cleveland, Toledo, Indianapolis, Louisville, and Minneapolis. In New Orleans and Cincinnati universities converted existent lecture programs into extension courses. Colorado and Wyoming formed state extension societies, while the University of California and Kansas offered extension courses in the major cities of each state.

At the Holiday season of 1891 representatives of many of these groups met at Association Hall of the Philadelphia YMCA at the invitation of the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching for the First National Conference on University Extension. It seems likely that the leadership of the American Society viewed the conference as a vehicle through which it might exercise some control over the mushrooming extension agencies. The conference heard William T. Harris and Bishop John Vincent, and representatives of the YMCA and the American Federation of Labor praise extension as a means of spreading the virtues of university learning among the masses. Self-congratulation continued as representatives of agencies in 20 states reported on their progress.

But as the delegates listened, the leaders of the American Society recognized that their hopes of leading a unified national extension movement were doomed. In the first place the various experiments were incredibly diverse. In some cities such as New Orleans "university extension" was simply a new name applied to an old system of free university public lectures with little or no class work, reading, or examinations. Meanwhile extension agencies in Philadelphia and the Midwest followed the English model closely. At the other extreme the University of California's extension program was little more than regular university credit classes conducted off campus. Secondly, while extension generally referred to classes in literature, history, and the social sciences, at Rutgers, courses in Agriculture received the same name.[13] The grafting of part of all of the English model onto preexistent American public lecture systems produced a variety of hybrids.

What all this confusion in the content and organization of university extension meant was that circumstances had shattered the possibility of a coordinated national extension movement as in England. The conference was the last significant gathering of those interested in extension on a national level: the future lay with local adaptation of the English model.

The years following the first national conference was the seven fat years of English-style university extension in the United States. In Philadelphia the American Society entered upon a period of general prosperity. Enjoying the financial beneficence of its wealthy board of directors, governed by talented and dedicated officers, drawing on its own lecturers and prominent English visitors to carry the teaching burden, and attracting both a nucleus of serious students and a large number of the merely curious, the Society solidified its position as the most noteworthy independent agency, conducted a summer meeting, and established a training school for lecturers.

Midwestern extension also progressed steadily through these seven years. the University of Chicago's program continued at about the same level as in the early 1890's and faced the same sorts of problems--chiefly those revolving around the relationship between the extension division and the rest of the university. To the north, extension at the University of Wisconsin underwent a revivification with the appointment of Jerome Raymond as director in 1894. Completely dedicated to the movement, he zealously promoted it during his three years at Madison.

With extension courses in operation in many areas we may pause to ask three important questions: who were the lecturers?, who were the students?, and what did they study?

Qualified, enthusiastic lecturers were essential to successful extension work and were in constant demand by both independent societies and university extension divisions. President Edmund J. James of the American Society identified three principal requisites: specialized subject matter knowledge, interest in educational ideas, and acquaintance with the technical details of university extension. His successor, Charles Brinley, wrote that "Without enthusiasm for the work, a good presence, good manners, a fairly good style in speaking, knowledge, and a disposition to encourage reading and study on the part of the audience" a man will not succeed.[14] In these two lists James and Brinley walked a very thin line between two types of qualities: one revolving around academic background and competence and the other centering on personality and enthusiasm. In actual practice success depended more on the second type of qualities; hence, although it would be unfair to say that university extension did not attract scholarly lecturers, the men who did the greatest part of the lecturing owed their success more to their personality or to the popularity of their subject than to their scholarly fame.

Whether in independent society or university the burden of lecturing weighed heaviest on the staff lecturer, a man whose total or principal job was extension teaching. Condemned to a life of hotels and railway cars, these missionaries of culture often visited as many as six different towns a week, repeating the circuit six or twelve times--no wonder they sought campus teaching if possible![15] For a brief moment staff lecturing appeared to be a promising career for a young academic, and the American Society opened a seminary in Philadelphia to train men for it; but a year later the seminary closed for lack of students.[16]

Supplementing the staff lecturer was the English visitor. Between 1890 and 1900 the seven most active of these men presented over 125 courses in the United States. Especially popular with American audiences were Richard Moulton, Hilaire Belloc, and W. Hudson Shaw. The English lecturer added an exotic touch, bringing with him the mystique of Oxford or Cambridge, and, for English history and literature classes, adding, even by his accent, a legitimacy which an American lecturer could never match.[17]

A final source of extension lecturers about which much less is known is the group of American professors who taught one or a few extension courses before apathy, failure, or the necessary travel killed their enthusiasm. In general, their failure to respond to the challenges of extension teaching provides solid evidence that in the 1890's most professors had a narrow conception of the universities social role.

Although one can discover much about the lecturer, information about students is rarely available. In the first place student communications with the central office are rare as his dealings were with the local centers highly ephemeral organizations leaving few records. Second, most student-lecturer communication was oral, before, during, and after class. Lecturers did note that women were overrepresented in class and that teachers were frequent students.[18] A prominent concern was the absence of a type of student the lecturer had hoped to attract: the working man.

After university extension had been established, organizational leaders and lecturers launched a campaign to interest laboring people in taking courses, and a few successes, especially in the Philadelphia area, misled them into believing that the laboring man hungered for extension classes. Certainly most lecturers did not naively enter on the quest for labor audiences, for they frequently warned each other of the peculiar problems which faced the lecturer who sought to interest laboring people: the laborer's independence, want of leisure time, lack of previous training, and financial condition; on the other hand, the danger of a patronizing lecturer speaking on an irrelevant topic.[19]

By 1891 reports flowed in to extension periodicals attesting to the failure to attract laborers. One lecturer summed up the prevailing puzzlement: "Just what is the way [to attract laborers] is hard to tell." What were the causes of this failure? Certainly such factors as pedantic and patronizing lecturers must be taken into account. Of great importance was the cost of extension, the usual rate being about $1.50 for a six lecture course, a large chunk of a laborer's weekly pay. The location of urban local centers in middle class neighborhoods, far from laborer's homes, with the additional cost of streetcar fare, was a substantial investment in time and money for the laborer. Many classes met in Protestant churches which Edward Bemis aptly described as "terra incognita" to many laborers. Finally, the laborer had little time to prepare for class, write exercises or do outside reading. In short the structure of extension courses was arranged for a different life style than that of the laborer. Extension's failure to attract the laborer was a serious one, for through it could have come an initial link between an increasingly liberal professoriate and the laborer and his problems.[20]

In evaluating the impact of English-style university extension the subject areas which students and lecturers selected and the seriousness of the study are of great importance. Theoretically, the lecturer could offer a course on any topic, but since nearly all of them were college professors or had amibitions to such a position, the curriculum was practically limited to more or less popularized versions of college courses. Across the nation literature and history were clearly the students' favorites. Within the field of literature English Romantic and Victorian poetry were especially popular. American literature was not a frequent choice, although America's history was more popular than any other nation's. There were flurries of interest in music courses and in civics lectures directed at the immigrant poor. Other subjects appearing with frequency were political science, economics, and natural science.[21] The value which a student gained from extension study varied directly with the amount of work done. Although most students attended the lectures, only about one-third remained for the class session which followed where readings were discussed and written assignments made and received. Finally, less than one percent of the students completed all the readings, written assignments, and final examination necessary to earn a certificate or credit.[22] Thus there is little doubt that many students attended out of mere curiosity, or because extension was a fad, or at the insistence of a spouse, relative, or friend. But each local center came to count on a nucleus of serious students.

These seven fat years gave an indication of how Americans received, developed, and altered English university extension. First, extension prospered only where it was a part of a university or if run by a wealthy independent society. Second, extension courses appealed chiefly to people who, perhaps a trifle unfairly, can be termed dilettantes. Third, there was a sufficient supply of lecturers even if staff lecturers whose university credentials were questionable did most of the teaching.

As in the case of the Egyptians so in the case of university extension, seven lean years followed the fat ones. By the late 1890's old enthusiasts puzzled over the failure of extension classes to have more than a passing fancy for most Americans. Ironically, Herbert Baxter Adams who had sparked the importation of extension was the first to issue a prognosis. Among the reasons which Adams identified for the failure of English-style university extension were scarcity of money and lecturers, vast American distances, "the necessity and greater importance" of work on campus, and the growth of free public lectures as a less expensive means of adult education. In the same year former lecturer Lyman P. Powell traced the decline of extension to "Western university and college presidents [who] came East each spring to lie in wait for postgraduate students newly doctored in Baltimore or Germany."[23] Extension depended on the few men who could not land a college job or who preferred extension to university lecturing. Almost by definition these men had lesser scholarly reputations, fewer opportunities to make one, and hence, lower prestige.

By 1900 English-style university extension was widespread only around Chicago and Philadelphia, but events of the next two decades doomed it in these places as well. The courses of the American Society changed drastically after 1900 as individual lectures on popular subjects replaced courses of lectures with readings, discussion, and examination. Poetic and dramatic readings crept into the schedule as did illustrated travelogs. Slowly the transition from an educational to an entertainment agency was completed. By 1922 the American Society had lost any connection with university extension as understood in the 1890's, and its officers recognized its new role by voting to merge with the Civic Club, the City Club, and the Academy of Music to form the Philadelphia Forum. The Forum was "an amplification of the University Extension idea adapted to the modern conception of a forum seeking to present a well-rounded program of civic interest."[24]

The decline of the extension division of the University of Chicago paralleled chronologically that of the American Society but differed in most other factors. There was not a slow undermining of the high standard of English extension, but a sudden crash around 1910 when festering faculty discontent finally resulted in action. Several important lecturers left the university to seek the more remunerative life of an independent lecturer and severe illness kept Richard Moulton off the platform. President Harry Judson seemed less friendly to the extension division than had Harper. After a disastrous 1910-11 academic year, Walter Payne, director of the extension division, urged the university to transform university extension into a plan for "popular adult education in Chicago," a plan never implemented.[25] Extension on the English model had ended.

The decline of extension in Chicago and Philadelphia indicates that if it was under professorial control as at Chicago it was dependent on faculty willingness to teach and happiness with salary and working conditions, but if controlled by the audience as in Philadelphia it was subject to their whims and fancies in subject matter and degree of seriousness.

Although university extension on the English model was all but dead by 1912 one could not argue that the twenty-five year experiment had been a total loss. Over 2,000,000 people had attended lectures, some of them the laboring poor. Extension helped the universities and their faculties to keep in contact with the people at a time when they could have moved in the direction of an intellectual aristocracy based on research.

20

Although the idea of university extension was a sound one the English model needed reorientation, a reorientation which took place in the state universities.

Under the direction of Louis Reber the University of Wisconsin led in the reorientation of university extension. Reber had no connection with any of the English-style extension agencies, and in 1906 he drew up a program heavily weighted toward business and engineering. The emphasis shifted from the cultural to the practical; from scholarship to service. The goal was no longer to approximate university work off-campus--although Reber did not deny the desirability of this goal--but to orient the extension curriculum to the needs of the state and its citizens. Extension no longer implied a professor, a podium and students; it could mean a professor drawing up a model city charter or testing chemicals to aid industry. More than the extension program of the 1890's it emphasized the role of the university in distributing the benefits of modern science; the "broker" university, a parallel to the "broker" state of the Progressives.[26]

By 1915 twenty-two institutions, seventeen of the state universities, established or made over extension departments on the Wisconsin model. The spread of the new extension led to a National Conference at Madison in March, 1915. The majority of the delegates were administrators of extension divisions, professionals bent upon the formation of a national society to endure longer than had the first. The only dissenting voices were those of the Old Guard. Richard Moulton expressed concern over the vocational and technical emphasis of the new extension programs, and Nathaniel Butler warned of overconfidence. But the future lay with men like Louis Reber and his fellow members of the newly formed National University Extension Association.[27]

How does the story of university extension between 1885 and 1915 fit into the history of American adult education? I believe the most significant development is the shifting of adult education from voluntary association to formal educational institution. In this respect the history of university extension parallels that of the kindergarten: foreign import, tried first by voluntary societies, later redefined and institutionalized.

Writing about university extension in 1891, Melvil Dewey predicted that "the historian of a century later will probably record that in the last two decades of the 19th century was developed that new system which marked an era in the history of higher education."[28] Although a century has not passed it is a safe judgment that his forecast was overly optimistic. The importation of English-style extension in the 1880's, its growth in the 1890's, and its death and transfiguration after 1905 are not epic events in the history of adult or of higher education. But they do remind the less sanguine American of the 1970's of the usefulness as well as the problems of university involvement in society.

22

Footnotes

1. The best one volume history of American adult education is C. Hartley Grattan, *In Quest of Knowledge: An Historical Perspective on Adult Education* (New York: Association Press, 1955).

2. For the early work of Stuart see James Stuart *Remininscences* (London: By the author, 1911), pp. 156-157; James Stuart "The Origin of University Extension," *University Extension III* (July, 1893), 1-3. On the history of extension in England see Robert D. Roberts, *Eighteen Years of University Extension* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891); Thomas Kelly *A History of Adult Education in Great Britain* (Liverpool University Press, 1962); John F. Harrison, *Learning and Living: A History of Adult Education in Great Britain* (London: Routledge and Paul, 1961). Also useful are Robert D. Roberts (ed.), *Aspects of Modern Study: University Extension Addresses* (London: Macmillan, 1894); W.H. Draper, *University Extension* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956).

3. Carl Bode, *The American Lyceum: Town Meeting of the Mind* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956).

4. John H. Vincent, *The Chautauqua Movement* (Boston: Chautauqua Press, 1886); John S. Noffsinger, *Correspondence Schools, Lyceums, Chautauqua* (New York: Macmillan, 1926).

5. United States Bureau of Education, *Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year, 1885-1886* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1887), pp. 748-749; Herbert B. Adams, "Seminary Libraries and University Extension," in Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Fifth Series (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1887), pp. 21-32; J. N. Larned, "An Experiment in University Extension," *Library Journal XIII*

(March-April, 1888), pp. 75-76; Bemis to Adams, December 22, 1887; January 30, 1888; Bemis to Mrs. Adams, January 3, 1902 in Herbert Baxter Adams Papers, Johns Hopkins University Library.

6. George Vincent to Adams, October 20, 1888; May 26, 1891; James Creese, *The Extension of University Teaching* (New York: American Association for Adult Education, 1941), pp. 38-40; Herbert Baxter Adams, "University Extension and Its Leaders," *Review of Reviews*, III (July, 1891), pp. 593-609; Adams, "American Pioneers of University Extension," *Educational Review*, II (October, 1891), pp. 220-230.

7. "University and School Extension," (Unsigned Editorial) *Science* XVI (December 19, 1890), 344; United States Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year, 1889-1890, (2 Vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893), I, pp. 833-835; George Vincent to Adams December 1, 1888; December 5, 1888; Melvil Dewey to Adams, February 8, 1889.

8. James E. Russell, "The Extension of University Teaching in England and America: A Study in Practical Pedagogics," Presented to the University of Leipsic (sic) for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, (Leipsig: n.p., 1895) p. 178; William B. Shaw to Adams, May 4, 1890; May 16, 1890; August 24, 1890; Melvil Dewey to Adams, May 1, 1891.

9. Middle States and Maryland Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, *Proceedings of the Annual Convention, Princeton, New Jersey, 1890* (New York: Globe Printing House, 1891), pp. 37-48; Melvil Dewey to Adams, November 10, 1890; National Education Association, *Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association, Toronto, 1891* (New York: J. J. Little, 1891), p. 37; Education XI (February, 1891), 376-377 (April, 1891), 508; *Educational Review I* (April, 1891), 388.

10. Francis N. Thorpe, *The Life of William Pepper*, (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1904), pp. 385-394; "The Constitution of the Philadelphia Society for the Extension of University Teaching," (Pamphlet) (Philadelphia: The Society, [1890]), in Box 1, Miscellaneous University Extension Material, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; George Henderson, *Report Upon the University Extension Movement in England* (Philadelphia: The Society, 1890); Henderson to Adams, October 20, 1890; Richard G. Moulton, "Address of Richard G. Moulton on the University Extension Movement," (Philadelphia: American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, n.d.); Moulton to Adams, December 6, 1890; December 13, 1890; January 30, 1891; March 23, 1891; William Pepper to Edmund J. James, March 16, 1891; March 30, 1891 in Edmund J. James Papers, University Archives, University of Illinois Library, Champaign.

11. Merle Curti and Vernon Carstensen, *The University of Wisconsin, 1848-1925*, (2 Vols. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949), I, p. 711-712, 715-720; Frederick Rosentreter, *The Boundaries of the Campus* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1957), pp. 17-22; Frederick Jackson Turner to Herbert Baxter Adams, September 27, 1890; December 8, 1890; May 7, 1891; October 19, 1891; December 29, 1891; January 18, 1892; Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Extension Work of the University of Wisconsin," *University Extension I* (April, 1892), 311-321.

12. For Harper's early attitude about university extension see his article, "The University Organization in Relation to University Extension," *Book News IX* (May, 1891), 343-345. For faculty hiring see Richard G. Moulton to Adams, February 18, 1891; Melvil Dewey to William Rainey Harper, January 23, 1892 in Presidents' Papers, University of Chicago Archives, 1892-1925; *University Extension I* (May, 1892), 363. The Chicago extension plan is described in the *Annual Register* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,

1892), pp. 173-199; and in the "Official Bulletin, No. 6, May, 1893," p. 3, in Presidents' Papers. Faculty discontent finds expression in Moulton to Harper, February 1, 1893; February 25, 1893; February 19, 1894; October 12, 1895; February 25, 1897. Also in Bemis to Adams, April 12, 1893; April 28, 1893; April 6, 1894; May 14, 1894.

13. Descriptions of the various programs and a report on the convention itself can be found in *The Proceedings of the First National Conference on University Extension...* (Philadelphia: J. Lippincott, 1892).

14. Edmund J. James, "A New Career for College Men," *American Monthly Review of Reviews VII* (June, 1893), 578-580; Charles Brinley to Adams, January 8, 1898.

15. W. C. Robinson, "The Circuit," *University Extension*, I (May, 1892), pp. 344-350.

16. "The University Extension Seminary," *University Extension*, I (May, 1892), pp. 356-362; *Ibid.*, II (November, 1892), 157-158; M. G. Brumbaugh, "The Seminary and Its Opportunity," University Extension, II (January, 1893), 208-209.

17. American Society for the Extension of University Teaching, *Ten Years Report of the American Society for the Extension of University Teaching* (Philadelphia: The Society, 1961), p. 22; *University Extension*, II (February, 1893), 251; *Citizen* I (March, 1895), 46; *Ibid.*, IV (August, 1898), 125.

18. "Students Associations as a Factor in University Extension in America," *Citizen*, III (November, 1897), 219; "The Conference of Students Associations," *Citizen*, II (June, 1896), 146-147.

19. David Kinley, "University Extension and the Workingman,"

University Extension, III (January, 1894), 205-212; Charles Zueblin, "The Lecturer and the Laborer," *Ibid.*, 213-216.

20. R. E. Thompson, "Observations on University Extension," *Ibid.*, III (June, 1894), 391-396; E. W. Bemis, "University Extension Among the Wageworkers," *Ibid.*, IV (October, 1894), 97-102.

21. "The Courses and Centers of 1891-92," *University Extension*, II (July, 1892), 7-20; "The Courses and Centers of 1892-93," *Ibid.*, II (June, 1893), 394; "Lectures, Autumn, 1895-Winter, 1896," *Citizen*, I (October, 1896, 269; "Lecture Courses Delivered During the Year, 1896-97," *Citizen* III (May, 1897), 77; "Lecture Courses Delivered During the Academic Year, 1897-98," *Ibid.*, IV (June, 1898), 95-96.

22. *Ten Years Report*, p. 12.

23. Herbert B. Adams, "Summer Schools and University Extension," in Nicholas Murray Butler (ed.), *Monographs on Education in the United States*, (Albany: J. Lyon & Co., 1900); Lyman P. Powell, "Ten Years of University Extension," *Atlantic Monthly* LXXXVIII (September, 1901), 393-403.

24. The changes in the American Society are evidenced in the flyers, pamphlets, and brochures in a file in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Among the most important are "General Announcement of 1904-1905;" "University Extension Lectures, 1906-1907;" "Condensed Summary of Principal Events for the Season of 1913;" "Announcement, 1919-1920;" and the *Philadelphia Forum Magazine*, Volumes 1-2, especially II (September, 1922), 5.

25. The most valuable sources for examining the decline of extension at Chicago are the yearly presidential reports: *1902-01*, pp. 163-173; *1905-06*, pp. 81-91; *1906-07*, pp.

73-80; *1907-08*, pp. 107-110; *1908-09*, p. 109; *1909-10*, pp. 99-101; *1910-1911* pp. 105-114; as well as private correspondence: Charles Zueblin to Harper, August 25, 1904; Harper to Zueblin, October 4, 1904; Zueblin to Harry P. Judson, January 15, 1907; Walter Payne to Zueblin, January 16, 1907; Richard Moulton to Judson, October 6, 1908; Judson to Moulton, October 7, 1908.

26. Curti and Carstensen, *The University of Wisconsin*, II, pp. 561-562; Chronology of the Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin, in Box 1, Chester Allen Papers, University of Wisconsin Archives; Rosentreter, *Boundaries of the Campus*, pp. 17-56.

27. Proceedings of the First National Conference on University Extension at Madison, Wisconsin, March 10-12, 1915, (n.p., n.p., n.d.), *passim*

28. Melvil Dewey, "New York's Part in University Extension," *Critic*, XVI (August 22, 1891), 90-99.

SHE COULD ALWAYS TEACH

by

Mrs. Kay Hodes Kamin, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Education
Rosary College

Teaching in contemporary American society is generally considered to be a feminine profession. Not only do women outnumber men at the primary and secondary levels, but the role of a teacher is judged a proper and natural one for the female sex. So "proper" and "natural" is this job for women that career counseling for educated females over the years has taken on the familiarity of a cliche. The college woman has been eagerly advised by parents and vocational counselors that she **could** and **should** teach.

This advice which stresses easy entree into teaching for women and underscores the naturalness and propriety of such a feminine profession can be traced back as early as the 1800's, when, for example, Lucy Larcom wrote about her career plans in the following manner:[1]

> *I liked the thought of self support, but I would have chosen some artistic or beautiful work if I could. I had no especial aptitude for teaching, and no absorbing wish to be a teacher, but it seemed to me that I might succeed if I tried.*

Today a sample of this same attitude can be found on almost any liberal arts campus. When questioned about future career plans, a co-ed most often responds, "I'm not really sure, but I guess I can always teach."[2]

Since this long accepted social attitude has had profound effects upon teachers and women, the focus of this paper is on the historic impact of this attitude on teaching as a profession and on the female struggle for educational and vocational equality in America. The study will trace the evolution of teaching from a male to a female profession and will analyze the social context in which large numbers of women were encouraged to enter teaching but were restricted from full participation in the profession.

Any study of the role of women teachers in the United States must begin with a statement to the effect that teaching within the home, from the earliest times, has been considered one of the natural and proper functions of a mother. This view can be documented by many sources. One of the most valuable and interesting sources for this idea was **Godey's Lady's Book**, a magazine which reflected and shaped much of nineteenth century social opinion.[3]

> *Children, in the early period of life, are almost wholly under the care and direction of the mother. Their minds are developed under her tender and constant cultivation. Their characters are usually formed at an early period, when their ideas being few, impressions are easily made, and when they naturally apply to their mother for advice and instruction. Besides the greater freedom which is observable in their intercourse with her than with their father, and the fact that they are almost continually in her society, it constitutes a great part of her occupation to unfold their tender powers, and to impart to them the rudiments of their education.*

Colonial New England provides the first historical references to a woman performing teaching duties for children other than her own. It was common practice even well into the nineteenth century for an older woman possessing a rudimentary education to open her living room or kitchen to the children of the neighborhood for a small sum of money. Although this practice was referred to as keeping a dame school, its function was more babysitting than education. A young lady who attended one of these schools explained its purpose.[4]

> *I began to go to school when I was about two years old, as other children about us did. The mothers of those large families had to resort to some means of keeping their little ones out of mischief, while they attended to their domestic duties. Not much more than that sort of temporary guardianship was expected of the good dame who had us in charge.*

A woman who performed this useful employment was usually widowed or a town charge. More rarely she was a mother with children of her own.[5] Many children were able to learn their alphabet, catechism and manners at the knees of these dames, but there was no formalized structure to this education.

An analysis of the dame school quickly yields the following generalization. The role of a teacher in this setting was perfectly in keeping with the role of a woman in early American society. She stayed at home and she was responsible for the care of little children. Her teaching was not considered to be professional, but rather part of her proper feminine function. The only less than proper feature of this work was that the dame supported herself by earning wages. This tended to group her with other low status women who were forced to seek work.

Most early documents show that any teaching conducted outside the home was considered the province of men. The primary and secondary schools of colonial New England were kept by males. Caleb Bingham recorded this fact in his memoirs when he wrote that the public teachers at the primary level were "uneducated men selected for their skill in penmanship and the elements of arithmetic."[6] The secondary schools were kept by ministers or masters possessing some formal education. Although a few private venture schools in the 1700's were taught by women for young girls, with few exceptions men were thought to be the natural and proper school teachers.[7]

It was not until the Massachusetts Law of 1789 that the expression "master and mistress" made statutory recognition of women as teachers outside the home setting.[8] Before this time any women who may have been employed in this capacity had no legal or professional standing and could not collect her wages except upon the good graces of her employer. Since it is noted that some women began to be associated with men as public school teachers after this date, one may conclude that the new protection of the Massachusetts law was an inducement for women to enter the profession, but their numbers remained insignificant.[9]

It is generally understood that the first major opportunity for large numbers of women to enter the teaching profession was supplied by the common school movement in the early nineteenth century. This movement for free, universal education created a demand for a plentiful supply of teachers. Thomas H. Gallaudet expressed this need in the *Connecticut Common School Journal* when he wrote:[10]

> *How shall we get good teachers for our district schools, and enough of them? While we should encourage our young men to enter upon this patriotic, and I had almost said, missionary, field of duty, and present much higher inducements to engage them to do so, I believe every one must admit, that there is but little hope of attaining the full supply, or anything like it, from that sex. This will always be difficult, so long as there are so many other avenues open in our country to the accumulation of property, and the attaining of distinction. We must, I am persuaded, look more to the other sex for aid in this emergency, and do all in our power to bring forward young women of the necessary qualifications to be engaged in the business of common school instruction.*

Catherine Beecher, in her book *True Remedy*, tried to estimate the number of teaching positions which would be opened to women by the spread of the common school movement. She projected:[11]

> *There are now more than two million children in this country without any schools. There are probably as many more in schools taught by men, who could be far more appropriately employed in shops or mills, or other masculine pursuits. Were all these children placed in schools at the ordinary rate of apportionment of pupils to teachers, it would require two hundred thousand women to meet the demand.*

By 1838, women outnumbered men as teachers in the Massachusetts common schools by a ratio of three to two.[12] Nevertheless, Horace Mann and others were urging that even more women be hired. This was unquestionably because the common school movement created a demand for cheap teachers. One of the major obstacles to the idea of free, universal education was the taxpayers' reluctance to bear the expense. This factor made women even more desirable teachers than men because they would work for less money. As Horace Mann asked rhetorically in the following statement:[13]

> *And is it not an unpardonable waste of means, where it can possibly be avoided, to employ a man, at twenty-five or thirty dollars a month, to teach the alphabet, when it can be done much better, at half-price, by a female teacher?*

Friends of the common school movement continued to press for the employment of women teachers. The flowery rhetoric which they adopted for this purpose tried to convince the public that if women were the natural and proper teachers of children within the home then they were also the natural and proper teacher of children outside the home. This was especially true, the argument went, if the common schools were to take over child rearing tasks formerly performed in the home. The following extract from Horace Mann utilized this form of rhetoric and gives the major inducements for hiring women.[14]

> *That females are better fitted by nature than males to train and educate young children is a position, which the public mind is fast maturing into an axiom. With our economical habits in regard to all school expenditures, is a material fact, that the services of females can be commanded for half the price usually paid to males. But what is of far higher moment is, that they are endowed by nature with a stronger affection for children: they have quicker sympathies, livelier sensibilities, and more vivid and enduring parental instincts. They are more free from coarse and vulgar practices, and their ears are unassailed by the voice of that political ambition which constitutes the madness of our times. Among all the diversified employments of life, there is none higher, worthier, more dignified or more honorable, than that of an educated female character, who is reproducing, in the hearts of children, her own exalted sentiments of truth of duty.*

Many women joined in the battle for the common schools and promoted the employment of female teachers. One of the most notable of these women was Emma Willard. She wrote in her *Address to the Legislature of New York* in 1819: [15]

> *That nature designed for our sex the care of children, she has made manifest, by mental as well as physical indications. She has given us, in greater degree than men, the gentle arts of insinuation, to soften their minds, and fit them to receive impressions; a greater quickness of invention to vary modes of teaching to dispositions, and more patience to make repeated efforts. There are many females of ability, to whom the business of instructing children is highly acceptable, and, who would devote all their faculties to their occupation. They would have no higher pencuniary object to engage their attention, and their reputation as instructors they would consider as important; whereas, whenever able and enterprising men, engage in this business, they consider it, merely as a temporary attainment of which, their best thoughts and calculations are all directed. If then women were properly fitted by instruction, they would be likely to teach children better than the other sex; they could afford to do it cheaper; and those men who would otherwise be engaged in this employment, might be at liberty to add to the wealth of the nation, by any of those thousand occupations, from which women are necessarily debarred.*

Although Mrs. Willard was to devote her life to furthering the education and employment opportunities of women, she was willing to grant certain major concessions in order to get a feminine foot inside the schoolhouse door. These included the notion that women should receive lower wages than men and that many other professions and occupations should remain closed to the female sex. Such verbal concessions were obviously necessary to her success in convincing a reluctant legislature to incorporate her seminary at Waterford and place it on the list of institutions which received a share of the literary fund.

Evidence supports the view that there was a conscious effort on the part of women such as Emma Willard to use the movement for popular education to further the educational and vocational advancement of women in the nineteenth century. Catherine Beecher speaks candidly of this effort when she wrote:[16]

> *Inasmuch, then, as popular education was the topic which was everyday rising in interest and importance, it seemed to me that, to fall into this current, and organize our sex, as women, to secure the proper education of the destitute*

> *children of our land, was the better form of presenting the object, rather than to start it as an effort for the elevation of woman. By this method, many embarrassments would be escaped, and many advantages secured.*

In another source, Miss Beecher goes so far as to envision the whole teaching profession as the province of women. But it is clear that she is advocating this not for the sake of the profession but for the advancement of women. She wrote:[17]

> *Women, then, are to be educated for teachers, and sent to the destitute children of this nation by hundreds and by thousands. This is the way in which a profession is to be created by woman -- a profession as honorable and as lucrative for her as the legal, medical, and theological professions are for men.*

Despite efforts to open the teaching profession to women, there were many factors which discouraged them from considering such a career. One of these factors was rooted deep in the traditional view that work of any kind outside the home was degrading to women.[18] Catherine Beecher commented that a woman would suffer a loss of status if she became a teacher. Said Miss Beecher, "a woman of high social position is ordinarily made to feel that, by becoming a teacher, she lowers her caste."[19]

Another factor limiting the appeal of a teaching career was its reputation for being unpleasant work. Caroline Dall in her book, *College, Market and the Court*, painted this bleak picture of nineteenth century, female teachers whom she knew.[20]

> *Society offered her no welcome.... Their meager salaries prevent them from dressing as ladies must be dressed for large company. For the same reason, their boarding places are obscure and lonely. The middle class of artisans, etc., who send their children to the public schools, seek no intercourse with those whose refinement seems to isolate them: the upper class look down upon them very kindly, but never think of inviting them to meet distinguished people, of showing them rare books or pictures, of stimulating their worn out faculties in any way.*

Henry Barnard credited the practice of "boarding around" with being the most objectionable facet of a teacher's life. He recorded in the *Connecticut Common School Journal*:[21]

> *... the practice of 'boarding round' still prevails very generally in the country districts. It may not be objectionable to young men, but to young ladies of education and refinement, it is attended with so many inconveniences that many are driven from this their appropriate field of labor and usefulness rather than encounter them.*

Certainly "boarding around" was unpleasant. Occasionally a teacher was permitted to stay in one domicile and have her board paid from public funds. More often, the privilege of boarding the teacher, like that of boarding town paupers in New England, was up for public competition and was awarded to the lowest bidders.[22]

Another factor which discouraged women from entering teaching was the low wages. Female teachers were very poorly paid. As Catherine Beecher lamented, "... the teachers of young children, as a general rule, receive poorer wages than are paid to the higher class of domestics."[23]

Not only were the salaries low, but there was apparent discrimination between male and female wages. A sampling of the average rate of wages paid to teachers in ten leading states in 1847 shows the depth of this discrimination. In only three states did a woman make even half the salary of a man. The greatest discrimination was in Massachusetts where the salaries of male teachers were more than three times the salaries of women.[24]

State	Male Salary per Month	Female Salary per Month
Vermont	$12.00	$ 4.75
Maine	15.40	4.80
Michigan	12.71	5.36
New Hampshire	13.50	5.65
Indiana	12.00	6.00
Connecticut	16.00	6.50

New York	14.96	6.69
Massachusetts	24.51	8.07
Ohio	15.42	8.73
Pennsylvania	17.02	10.09

Perhaps the single most important factor, however, which kept a woman from considering a career in teaching was her inability to obtain the necessary education to qualify her for advancement within the profession. In the early nineteenth century, most schools above the primary level were closed to women. Thus many of the females who first entered teaching did so with a minimum amount of formal schooling or were completely selfeducated.[25] Such lack of qualifications obviously put them at a disadvantage in competing with men for the higher positions. Catherine Beecher bitterly protested this discimination when she said.[26]

> *The superior advantages provided for men enable them to compete with women on very unequal terms, even in the sole profession open to her. The best educated, of course, take precedence, and thus we see the posts of honor and emolument in education, even in the training of her own sex, to a wide extent, taken from women and given to man.*

Some commentators, like the following, unfairly blamed women for their lack of qualifications. He asked:[27]

> *Are those females, who propose to be candidates for teaching...: doing anything, by reading, conversation or studying, to fit themselves for a proper discharge of the duties they propose to undertake:—or do they think that the skill and the spirit, to perform the most difficult and most important of human labors, are to be miraculously given to them, when they cross the threshold of the schoolhouse door?*

More rational voices tried to call attention to the need for qualifying women as teachers. The leaders of the common school movement were among the first men to work for the education of women. Horace Mann became one of the champions of women's education when he wrote:[28]

> *... if a female is to assume the performance of a teacher's duties, she must be endowed with high qualifications. ... Opportunities, therefore, should be everywhere opened for the fit qualification of female teachers: and all females possessing in an eminent degree, the appropriate natural endowments, should be encouraged to qualify themselves for this sacred work.*

Since it was unthinkable for women to attend school with men, Mann was joined by Henry Barnard in proposing the establishment of special institutions to train female teachers at public expense. In the first volume of the *Connecticut Common School Journal*, Barnard suggested the following:[29]

> *... one or more seminaries, for female teachers, with model schools attached, should be provided, free, as far as tuition is concerned, and so located as to admit... profitable employment for a small portion of the time to meet the incidental expense of their residence there.*

The success of these men in convincing the public of the need to educate women to teach is substantiated by the following notice of the Massachusetts State Legislature announcing the opening of the first normal school in March, 1839.[30]

> *The Board of Education hereby give notice, that a Normal School for the qualification of Female Teachers for Common Schools, is to be established at Lexington, in the County of Middlesex. Applicants for admission to said School must have attained the age of sixteen years complete: they must be in the enjoyment of good health, and must declare it their intention to become school teachers after having finished a course of study at the Normal School.*

The main concern of Mann and Barnard was to secure qualified teachers for the common schools, but some leading women tried to expand their effort into the much broader area of education for all females. Catherine Beecher was doing this when she said:[31]

> *Every woman ought to be trained to act as an educator: and not only so, no woman ever ought to be considered as qualified to become the head of a family till she has been practically exercised in this her highest professional duty.*

An editorial in *Godey's* also attempted to develop the same argument when it asked:[32]

> *And when we consider, too, that every family is a school, and that woman, whether ignorant or educated, presides at these home seminaries, we are induced to ask with emphasis will it make any great difference, ten, twenty, or thirty years hence, with the political, moral, and religious interests of our country, whether the present generation of young girls are to enter upon their high duties with well disciplined minds and correct habits, or with characters directly the reverse?*

If negative social attitudes, sad living conditions, low wages and lack of educational opportunities did not deter a nineteenth century woman from embarking upon a career in teaching, she encountered further restrictions once she entered the profession. Some of these constraints involved questions of *who* she was allowed to teach and *when* she was allowed to teach. At first, women were hired only to teach girls or young boys who attended the summer sessions. The winter sessions were reserved for older boys and were taught exclusively by men. The rationale for this practice was explained in a School Committee Report from Ware, Massachusetts.[33]

> *Females are to too delicate a texture for the rudeness and consequential importance of boys fourteen, fifteen and sixteen years of age. A woman can do nothing with such, if they are disposed to be contrary. And there is a very natural feeling with boys of this age, that it is pusillanimous to obey a woman. The Committee honor the sex, and would not abridge their influence, in the least, in its proper sphere. Their fitness to instruct girls of any age and boys under ten, they do not question. They regard them as superior here to the sterner sex. But they would not recommend them as the best fitted for our winter district schools.*

Even Horace Mann, who desperately wanted women in teaching, felt that females should only be responsible for children under "ten or twelve years of age."[34] After that, he said, a child should "be subjected to the firmer grasp, to the more forcible subduing power of masculine hands."[35]

Despite the factors discouraging women from entering teaching and restricting her from full professional participation, many women chose to become teachers in the first half of the nineteenth century. The figures of Massachusetts from 1837 to 1850 tell the typical story of rapid substitution of women for men.[36]

Date	Men	Women
1837	2370	3591
1842	2414	4301
1850	2437	5238

In trying to determine why a woman would choose a teaching career, the most obvious reason was that this profession was open to her while others were not. The only possible alternatives for a woman who had to support herself were unpleasant. She could choose to enter domestic work or the sweat shops of the garment industry.[37]

Such evidence as I have seen supports the view that the women who entered teaching in the nineteenth century, like the Dames before them, did so because they needed the money. Contemporary notions of women working for self-fulfillment apparently did not exist. As Henry Barnard commented:[38]

> *... that class of females best qualified, by having enjoyed the advantages of superior and expensive schools, cannot be induced to enter the common schools as teachers, on account of the inadequate compensation, and the unnecessary difficulties and inconveniences connected with the employment.*

Those women who became teachers were apparently the daughters of middle or working class families who were expected to support themselves until marriage or they were widows. A list of student backgrounds for the first class at Lexington Normal School shows:[39]

29 widows
23 daughters of laborers
16 daughters of farmers
14 daughters of tradesmen
4 daughters of captains of merchant vessels

3 daughters of clerks
3 orphans
2 daughters of railway inspectors
2 daughters of newspaper editors

Further documentation of the middle to lower class origins of females who entered teaching is supplied by Catherine Beecher and Lydia H. Sigourney. Both sources claim that the private colleges and seminaries founded for women during this time were intended for the "intellectual training of women of the medium working classes"[40] who went "to prepare themselves for instructresses of common schools."[41]

An assessment of the historic impact of women in the teaching profession upon the advancement of women generally would lead one to conclude that it was a positive force. The need for a plentiful and cheap supply of teachers provided the first viable argument for the higher education of women. The demand for teachers was directly responsible for the establishment of normal schools for women. By the middle of the nineteenth century, four other states had joined Massachusetts in founding such institutions.[42] Also private colleges and seminaries such as Emma Willard and Mount Holyoke were established to provide advanced female education with a teacher's training orientation.

The movement of women into the teaching profession also provided one of the first opportunities for a female to leave the confines of her home and enter a man's world outside. This feminine foot inside the schoolhouse door was undoubtedly an important precedent for other women to follow.

Moreover, educated women teachers became the standard bearers in the struggle for the advancement of women in America. In addition to Emma Willard and Catherine Beecher, such female leaders as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Coffin Mott and Lucy Stone all began their careers as teachers.[43]

Although the opening of the teaching profession to women seems to have had a positive effect upon their advancement, it is ironic to note that this same phenomenon seems to have had a negative effect upon the teaching profession. The presence of women in teaching appears to have hurt the standing of the profession in relation to other professions. Susan B. Anthony made this point most convincingly before a group of disgruntled schoolmen when she said:[44]

> *It seems to me, gentlemen, that none of you quite comprehend the cause of the disrespect of which you complain. Do you not see that, so long as society says a woman is incompetent to be a lawyer, minister, or doctor, but has ample ability to be a teacher, every man of you who chooses this profession tacitly acknowledges that he has no more brains than a woman.*

In other words as teaching became known as a feminine profession, men tended to be discouraged from entering it. Also the presence of large numbers of women in teaching apparently depressed the salary scale which made it an even less desirable profession for men.

Additionally as we discussed earlier, the women who entered teaching tended to be of middle to lower middle class origins and it is possible that the profession many have come to reflect the modest backgrounds of its practitioners.

Finally, it would seem that the very notion that "she could always teach" had a detrimental effect upon the teaching profession. Such a phrase suggests a profession that is easily entered and practiced by almost any female at any time. The implied accessibility of this profession juxtaposed against the inaccessibility of other professions certainly must have diminished its relative standing.

These conclusions are of course tentative and call for greater research. However their potential ramifications for the current women's liberation movement cannot go unnoticed. For instance, these conclusions suggest that a woman practitioner may only find status in a profession so long as women are in a distinct minority in that profession. For when a significant number of women appear in a profession, it may become known as a feminine profession, like teaching, and thus lose the very status which women are seeking. Also as long as women are willing to work for less money than men in order to get a foot in the door, their depressing influence on salary scales may tend to cheapen the profession.

Such possibilities should be considered by the women of today who are entering professional schools in unprecedented numbers. Equal access into the professions may not in fact prove the panacea for women's liberation which many believe it to be.

NOTES

1. Lucy Larcom, *A New England Girlhood* (New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Co.), p. 161.

2. Rosary College, River Forest, Ill., interviews with a selected group of upper classwomen, September, 1972.

3. *Godey's Lady's Book*, X (June, 1935), 258.

4. Larcom, p. 11.

5. Annie Meyer, ed., *Woman's Work in America* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1891), p. 7.

6. W. B. Fowle, "Memoir of Caleb Bingham," *American Journal of Education*, V (September, 1858), 327.

7. Thomas Woody, *A History of Women's Education in the United States* (2 Vols.: New York: The Science Press, 1929), I, 160.

8. Meyer, p. 11.

9. Helen Kenrick Johnson, *Woman and the Republic* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1897), p. 227.

10. Woody, p. 462.

11. Catherine Beecher, *True Remedy for the Wrongs of Women* (Boston: Phillips, Sampson, and Co., 1851), p. 33.

12. Horace Mann, *Life and Works of Horace Mann* (5 Vols.: Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1891), II, p. 98.

13. *Ibid.*, IV, p. 183.

14. *Common School Journal*, I (March 15, 1839), 85.

15. Emma Willard, *An Address to the Public* (Middlebury: Copeland, 1819), p. 47.

16. Catherine Beecher, *Godey's Lady's Book* XXII (November, 1852), 484.

17. Beecher, *True Remedy*, p. 241.

18. Elizabeth Pollack, "The Interests and Position of Woman in America during the 1840's and 50's as Revealed in some Women's Magazines of that Day" (Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Chicago, 1935), p. 87.

19. Beecher, *True Remedy*, p. 49.

20. Caroline Dall, *College, Market and the Court* (Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1868), p. 13.

21. *Connecticut Common School Journal*, III (May, 1841, 249.

22. Meyer, p. 11.

23. Beecher, *True Remedy*, p. 49.

24. Mann, *Life and Words*, IV, p. 184.

25. Lydia H. Sigourney, "Self-Educating Teachers," *Godey's Lady's Book*, XX (March, 1840), 140.

26. Beecher, *Godey's*, p. 484.

27. *Common School Journal*, II (March 16, 1840), 82.

28. Mann, *Life and Works*, III, p. 428.

29. *Connecticut Common School Journal*, I (May, 1839), 168.

30. *Common School Journal*, I (March 15, 1839), 96.

31. Beecher, *True Remedy*, p. 57.

32. *Godey's Lady's Book*, XXXVIII (February, 1859), 150.

33. *Common School Journal*, II (September 1, 1840), 278.

34. *Common School Journal*, VIII (April 16, 1846), 117.

35. Mann, *Life and Works*, II, p. 99.

36. Woody, p. 197.

37. Eleanor Flexner, *A Century of Struggle* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp.52-53.

38. *Connecticut Common School Journal*, I (May, 1839), 167.

39. Woody, p. 478.

40. Catherine Beecher, *Educational Reminiscences and Suggestions* (New York: J.B. Ford and Company, 1874), p. 92.

41. *Godey's Lady's Book*, XIV (June, 1837), 281.

42. Woody, p. 480.

43. Flexner, pp. 69-85.

44. Johnson, p. 230.

THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1968--A Neo-Hegelian View

by

Robert E. Mason
Professor of Education
Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville

The purpose of this essay is to examine whether the attempted Revolutions in the cities and universities in the United States, France, and Germany between 1964 and 1971 may be construed reasonably. That is, whether explanations can be given for the events of these Revolutions that would attribute rationality to the events.

This hypothesis has, as a matter of fact, not been examined in depth for a number of reasons, namely:

1) Commitment to civility is a tradition in the United States. Americans have viewed violence and incivility as expressions of unreason except when apparently serving as instruments of controlled police, military deterrent, or preventive action. We hold that deliberate official use of violence and incivility never occurs in the United States.

2) Attributing incivility to non-rational motives or sources, non-rational factors in the home, in institutions, or in the society at large to explain resort to force and incivility have been sought. The notion that the society is sick has been entertained.

3) To the degree that to any extent the possibility of revolt, conspiracy, and/or violence as grounded rationally has been entertained, there has arisen the assumption of political conspiracy, and the unsubstantiated hypothesis that Revolutionaries are subsidized by Mao, the Cubans, or their ilk.

4) Popular folklore dealing with the Revolutions in the cities and

on the campuses has joined 2) and 3) above in speculation that agents of conspiracy, subsidized by Mao and Castro, have recruited among disenchanted American youth. These young people, so goes the jargon, are unloved progeny of the American country-club set, alienated from self and society in the impersonality of the large university. Students have become holes in IBM cards, starved for meaning, but nurtured only by one or another form of atheistic agnosticism, without hope, without ideals.

The popularity of such explanations of the Revolutions of the 'Sixties may be symptomatic of a strange anti-intellectualism shared by scholars as well as common people. It has been difficult for anyone to entertain the possibility that the Revolutions are reasonable events explicable on rational grounds.

The title attached to this paper is, obviously, to be criticized as part and parcel of the substance. If you discard the substance of the analysis, you will discard the title. Events designated by the title begin in Berkeley in 1964, rise to a dramatic apogee in New York, Paris, Berlin, and the Great American City Ghettoes in 1968, concluding with a secondary climax in America after the Kent State killings of May 4, 1970.

I

Consider that the Selma, Alabama, demonstrations and marches of 1963-1965 were demonstrations of the old methodology. People marched, and stood, occasionally receiving but not themselves perpetrating violence. The assumption was that such open demonstration of position would work to sway opinion and influence political process. The Selma voter registration drive sponsored by SNCC beginning in 1963, spear-headed a non-violent effort by old-school liberal democrats to assist in school desegration and voter registration. This was countered by night riders, church burnings, and death by gunfire of blacks and whites. After Selma, instances of the liberal democratic methodology of non-violent demonstration, "teach-ins," and marches, although continuing, declined in importance, and new techniques of deliberate incivility, confrontation, demand, and contrived terror took center stage.

The methodology of incivility was introduced at Berkeley in the autumn of 1964. Mario Savio, a philosophy major and president of the University of California at Berkeley Chapter of Friends of SNCC organized what was called the Free Speech movement. This action was in response to the announcement by University of California officials that political activity would no longer be allowed on the Berkeley campus. On September 29, 1964, Berkeley students staged a 12-hour sit-in, and there were eight arrests. Savio was threatened with expulsion, and the situation on the Berkeley campus remained tense through October and November. On December 2-3, 1964, there was a mass sit-in resulting in negotiations between the Free Speech Movement leaders and the faculty, bargaining with the Board of Regents, and threat of a student strike.

Meantime, old democratic liberals participated in some marches and relatively peaceful demonstrations organized by the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam. "Teach-ins," silent vigils at the Pentagon, relatively peaceful rallies and sit-downs continued through the Spring of 1965. In August of 1965, however, the methodology of incivility, confrontation, and violence initiated in Berkeley was exhibited in the first Watts Rebellion in Los Angeles. Between August 11 and August 16, 1965, 7,000 to 10,000 people rioted in Watts. Looting occurred, whole sections were burned out, and a full 150 block area was taken over by rioters. Thirty-five persons were killed, many hundreds were injured, and property losses were estimated at $200,000,000. By August 16, 1965, there were more than 12,000 National Guardsmen, 1,400 city policemen, 1,000 sheriff's deputies, and 68 state highway patrolmen on riot duty in and around the Watts area. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. denied that the situation was a result of a criminal element.

In March of 1966 violence again erupted in Watts. Two persons were killed, 25 were injured, and 49 were arrested in a day long riot, in response to which the Los Angeles police sent 200 shotgun-armed men into the area. During 1967, campus protests against Dow Chemical and Navy recruiters continued; there was a Harvard University demonstration against Ambassador Goldberg; students and faculty groups signed petitions and drafted letters to the President in time-honored liberal democratic protocol. However, an increasing number of anti-draft incidents involving challenge and direct confrontation occurred, with large numbers of arrests in connection with these incidents, especially the Pentagon demonstrations in the Fall. But it was during the summer of 1967 that extreme violence erupted in many American cities. Detroit burned for a week, and the President of the United Stattes called out troops. Newark, Cincinnati, Nashville, and Cambridge, Maryland, also experienced warfare in the streets. The National Guard in full battle array was placed on duty in various American cities eighteen times during the summer of 1967. Eighty-seven people were killed.

These movements rose to a climax in 1968, and the bloody battles which in preceding years, with the exception of Berkeley, had centered in the city ghettoes, moved to campuses of universities here in Europe, and in Mexico. In the United States some fifty colleges and universities were shaken by campus riots, among them Cornell, Stanford, Brown, Columbia, the University of Michigan, the University of Illinois, the University of California, the University of Connecticut, the University of Miami, the University of Denver, Ohio University, and Brooklyn College. Throughout the year of 1968, disturbances continued at San Francisco State College, and there were shootings in Boston, Los Angeles, Berea, Kentucky, and Washington, D.C.

The months of dramatic climax were, however, April through August, 1968, beginning on April 4, 1968, with the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Between April 4 and April 11 serious riots occurred in 125 American cities. Forty-six persons were killed, ten of these in Washington, D.C.; 2,600 were injured, half of these in the capital city. Throughout the country an army of 55,000 full-armed troops was called out to order American citizens and 12,000 soldiers patrolled the national capital. For a time there were manned machine-gun emplacements on the grounds of the Capitol building and the Executive Mansion. Twenty-one thousand arrests were made in the nation.

Between April 11 and April 15, hard on the heels of these events in the United States, violent clashes between protesting students and police disrupted universities in West Germany and West Berlin. These riots followed an attempt upon the life of Rudi Dutschke, leader of the German SDS (Socialist League of West German Students). Chancellor Kurt Kiesinger was alarmed by the violence and returned to his office from a holiday because of it. Dutschke's views were said to be a mixture of Maoism, Marxism, Castroism, and Anarchism.

Only a few days later, on April 23, 1968, began the bloody confrontations at Columbia University, extending from April 23 to April 30, and requiring major attention from the Riot Squad of the New York police. Leading the Columbia activities of this week was Mark Rudd of the American SDS (Students for a Democratic Society).

Barely a week after the outbreak of the Columbia University fighting, the battle of the Latin Quarter in Paris began. On May 2, 1968, students in the Latin Quarter led by Daniel Cohn-Bendit threw cobblestones and home-made grenades at the Paris police. A strike call for May 6 was issued by the National Union of University Teachers, and fighting was violent in the Latin Quarter on May 6. Wildcat strikes in sympathy with the academic unions occurred throughout France disrupting the economic and social routines of the entire nation. However, the powerful French Communist party refused to take leadership in or engage in vigorous advocacy of the strike, Cohn-Bendit denouncing communist leaders as "Stalinist creeps." DeGaulle cut short a state visit to Romania in order to return to Paris and take charge in a national situation which was adjudged to be a major threat to the Gaullist government.

Premier Georges Pompidou speaking at a meeting of the National Assembly on May 14, 1968, said:

> *The events which we have just experienced are not just a flash of fire ... Our civilization is being questioned, not the government, not the institutions, not even France, but the materialistic and soulless modern society. I see no precedent in our history other than in the hopeless days of the 15th century, which the structures of the Middle Ages were collapsing.*[1]

Three weeks later, in the early morning of June 5, 1968, Robert F. Kennedy, charismatic leader of the younger anti-war liberals, was assassinated. This left the sophisticated white liberal-moderates without a chosen mentor, as the elimination of Martin Luther King, Jr. sixty days before had left Black moderate activists without leadership. Neither Ralph Abernathy nor Eugene McCarthy could fill these roles.

Toward the end of the month (June 28-30, 1968) Berkeley, California, was placed under curfew as police fought university students engaging in demonstrations ostensibly for the purpose of exhibiting solidarity with French students. Before the end of the summer (August 28-30) a horrified audience witnessed live on television the barbed wire fortifications erected to protect leading public figures at the Democratic political convention, and the brawlings and beatings between young people and the Chicago police marking this meeting.

In the autumn of 1968, thousands of university students and soldiers fought in Mexico City, and before order was restored after several days of street battles, 66 persons were killed.

Recapitulating events of May, June, July, August, and September, 1968, Washington, New York, Berlin, Paris, Chicago, and Mexico City had experienced massive confrontations between armed forces and civilians, the disturbances in Berlin, Paris, and Chicago being sufficiently powerful to shake the political processes of Germany, France, and the United States, Kiesinger was alarmed; DeGaulle rushed back from a major state visit to take charge; King was killed; Kennedy was killed; Johnson retired from politics and the Democratic Party in the United States was seriously if not irreparably damaged.

During the winter and spring of 1969 disturbances continued at American universities as well as in Argentina, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Mexico, Morocco, Portugal, South Vietnam, Spain, Turkey, and Venezuela. In April, one hundred Black students armed with shotguns, rifles, and knives occupied the Cornell University Student Union Building, and troops were called to the Harvard campus. From April through Commencement of 1969, turmoil reigned on many American university campuses and grotesque disruptions of traditional Commencement ceremonies occurred.

1969-70 was quieter on the campuses than 1968-69 until the Kent State killings of May 4, 1970. American university life was completely disrupted throughout the nation for the remainder of the 1969-70 year, the Brandeis University strike center reporting 448 universities on strike or closed at some time during the spring of 1970. With the fall of 1970 campuses remained calm. Since that time, despite isolated terroristic acts, mass Revolutionary activity centering in educational institutions has not been marked.

II

To inquire whether events summarized above can be construed rationally is not quite the same as to inquire whether the events in their particular timing, placement, and strategy follow a precise plan laid out by advance by an identifiable group of social and political engineers. The latter inquiry might be feasible but lies outside the scope of this paper. To the degree that the argument of this paper is deemed plausible, however, the possibility of such inquiry might be reasonably entertained. The task laid out here, however, is inquiry concerning possibility of a philosophical interpretation of events, not inquiry concerning the possibility of deliberate, planned conspiracy. That ideas were at work among the persons exercising leadership in some of the events recounted above is likely. Dutschke, Cohn-Bendit, Rudd were literary humanistic scholars-students of the letters and arts. Savio and Davis have been students of philosophy. Herbert Marcuse, an eminent Hegelian philosopher, was termed by Andrew Hacker in 1966 "... the foremost philosopher of the New Left," and Marcuse, in turn, dedicated his book, *An Essay on Liberation*, published in 1969, to the young militants of the Paris riots of May and June, 1968. Hence, an effort to construe the Revolutions of 1968 from the Neo-Hegelian perspective developed by Marcuse would appear not to be anachronistic.

Marcuse came to the United States in 1934 as a refugee from the barbarism of Adolf Hitler. He was a United States government consultant during World War II. After the War he taught at Columbia and Harvard and then joined the faculty at Brandeis. Professor Marcuse left Brandeis to become a member of the faculty at the University of California at San Diego in 1964.

Marcuse's intellectual roots are in Hegel and, thus, he is fully committed to the notion of social process and the life of culture and mind as dialectical. The very dynamic processes of history and human affairs are nourished by challenge and conflict, by the dialectical movement from that which is established toward the creative negation of the *status quo* in the critical spirit by which occurs a synthesis of the "is" and the "ought" in an ever-emerging future.

This way, the rational movement of the Absolute Idea in history is expressed in 1968 in a great explosion of negation in antithesis to the World Establishment. The student intellectuals bring to the centers of World power and influence a negation expressed in concert by peasants in China, Viet Cong, Mississippi share croppers, poor colored people in great industrial cities, outcasts, offbeat artists and eccentrics. Objective Reason moves and orchestrates the actions of men. Kennedy and King in their commitment to gradualism slowed the full surge of Revolutionary negation. Watts, Detroit, Berlin, Paris, Columbia, Berkeley, and Chicago all express the movement of the Absolute Idea in historical dialectic as established contemporary industrial society is confronted by its vital negation.

It is possible to contrast Marcuse's Revolutionary class with that identified in familiar alternative theories. For the old Marxists of the years before World War II, negation of the Establishment was to be located in the working proletariat. According to this theory, those who worked with muscles, backs, and limbs to move material goods through the various stages of fabrication opposed the capitalists who controlled the institutions of production. The interests of labor negated those of capital, and it was considered that the minds and spirits of men partook of the class orientation in which they were nurtured.

In this milieu the Teachers Union took form; George Counts, John

Childs, and Dewey himself maintained that the interests of teachers were more with labor than with capital. Thus they encouraged unionization, affiliated themselves, and taught that the teachers' dedication to criticism and the scientific method was one with the obligation of teachers to participate in organized labor. Against this view, Marcuse and the leaders of the Revolutions of 1968 held that organized labor had long since been co-opted to the Establishment and that both big labor and big capital had sold out to the corporate one-dimensional society. Organized labor could no longer be the source of critical negation of the Establishment for the interests of organized labor were bound up with maintenance of high wages, high employment, and plenty of fringe benefits, all made possible by full participation in the obscenities of the one-dimensional society -- Vietnam, planned obsolescence, despoiling for the environment by industrial pollution, continued oppression of Blacks, women, students, and persons below the age of 18.

Thus may be understood the intense internal conflict within Students for a Democratic Society in 1969-70, and the consequent enfeeblement of the New Left as the economic class ideology of the old Marxists clashed with the New Left revision of the structure of class conflict and the more promising source of negation. The June 18-22, 1969, Chicago convention of the SDS marked a crisis in the factional split between old and new Revolutionaries. The Progressive-Labor Party group saw Revolution in doctrinaire terms of class struggle. They saw student power and black power as counter-Revolutionary and insisted on a movement uncompromising in solidarity with the working proletariat. They insisted that the long-term process remains that of the struggle of economic classes -- the workers against the capitalist exploiters. The opposing major faction saw the Revolution led by students opposed to imperialism, with ties to the colored urban minorities and third world populations victimized by racist imperialism and colonialism. The Weathermen faction of SDS which has claimed credit for terrorist incidents from time to time to the present has been associated with this position.

Again, consider the contrast between Marcuse's view and that of

Mannheim, to whom a number of educational theorists were drawn in the 'forties and 'fifties. In Mannheim's distinctions between ideology and utopia there is a role for sub-conscious or non-rational elements of ideology in processes of social change. But Mannheim held that teachers, scholars, and intellectuals, by virtue of their devotion to the life of mind and their nurturing in the disciplines of scholarship could transcend the mind-shaping influence of social class. Thus, for Mannheim, the intellectuals constitute a special reservior of leadership capable of transcending the class-bound ideologies of laborers and capitalists. Marcuse does not agree with this. He has no more faith in the tenured university intellectuals than he has in organized labor. The established university has become as one-dimensional as the corporation. This being the case, organization intellectuals are as much slaves to the one-dimensional society as union leaders and corporation executives. All these are of the Establishment, and partake of the Establishment mentality.

Socialism has been deflected from its goal by the arms race. Competition with America has induced emulation of our standard of living. The vanguard of Revolution is now in Vietnam, Cuba, China, the guerilla forces of Latin America, the ghetto populations and students in the United States and France. Hence there is need for redefinition of conditions of socialism. Marcuse says in the Preface of *An Essay on Liberation*[3] that the essay was written before the fighting in France during May and June of 1969, but hails those events as harbingers of Revolution. The essay is dedicated to "these young militants."

A change in the very nature of man is a precondition for bringing about the new society. The true obscenity is the conspicuous waste which characterizes the Establishment. These "obscene exposures of the affluent society" are those which should produce shame and guilt. Thus a moral radicalism will forward a new morality to combat the prevailing system. The seeds of the new Revolution are in a total qualitative shift in needs and values.

> ***A utopian conception? It has been the great, real, transcending force, the 'idée neuve,' in the first powerful rebellion against the whole of the existing society, the the rebellion for the total transvaluation of values, for qual-***

> *itatively different ways of life: the May rebellion in France. The graffiti of the jeunesse en colère, joined Karl Marx and Andre Breton; the slogan 'l'imagination au pourior,' went well with 'les comités, (soviets) partout'; the piano with the jazz player stood well between the barricades; the red flag well fitted the stature of the author of Les Misérables;and striking students in Toulouse demanded revival of the language of the Troubadours, the Albigensians. The new sensibility has become a political force. It crosses the frontier between the capitalist and communist orbit; it is contagious because the atmosphere, the climate of the established societies, carries the virus.*[4]

Here are the elements of the new liberation--a rediscovery of biological man and a shameless, guiltless cultivation of the vital needs and impulses--art, imagination, music, the vernacular languages, these pursued explicitly by a generation of intellectuals who build a new total style of life and consciousness grounded in the "life instincts" rather than aggressiveness and guilt.

> *Technique would then tend to become art, and art would tend to form reality: the opposition between imagination and reason, higher and lower faculties, poetic and scientific thought would be invalidated. Emergence of a new sensibility and a desublimated scientific intelligence would combine in the creation of an aesthetic ethos.*[5]

It is possible now for the aesthetic model to shape the Form of the new society inasmuch as technology has made the conquest of scarcity a reality. The old Revolutionary doctrine presupposed scarcity; hence, the dynamic for change was among the workers. The affluent society has achieved economic abundance; the new utopian vision is of a world of beauty celebrating life, love, and the solidarity of mankind. "... a society in which the abolition of poverty and toil terminates in a universe where the sensuous, the playful, the clam, and the beautiful become forms of existence and thereby the Form of the society itself."[6]

The deadly seriousness of the old socialists gives way to love play, unsublimated joy, imaginative and whimsical ventures. The aesthetic morality is the opposite of puritanism, but it works to free the earth of the filth produced by a capitalistic technology. Not only a new morality but a new language is necessary to implement the Revolution. Surrealistic art, the new terminology and syntax of the Hippies and the Blacks, and cultivation of incivility and obscenity as measured by standard linguistic practice are examples.

> *If, for example, the highest executives of the nation or of the state are called not President X or Governor Y but pig X or pig U and if what they say in campaign speeches is rendered as "oink, oink," this offensive designation is used to deprive them of the aura of public servants or leaders who have only the common interest in mind. They are 'redefined' as that which they really are in the eyes of the radicals. And if they are addressed as men who have perpetrated the unspeakable Oedipal crime, they are indicted on the counts of their own morality: the order they enforce with such violence was born in their sense of guilt.*[7]

Other examples are "soul," "black is beautiful," "flower power," and the inversions of standard usage in dress, hygiene and display of the body. Marcuse goes so far as to suggest that the "trip" has its meaning in the "momentary dissolution of the ego shaped by established society" and foreshadows the revolution in perception which must shape the new aesthetic culture.

Once again, we are reminded that sourcing the Revolution in young intellectuals nurtured in middle-class culture, and in ghetto populations runs contrary to the Marxian tradition of social class analysis. Marcuse is very much aware of this and of the fact that his insistence on biological and aesthetic rather than economic foundations for the new society is opposed by standard Marxists. But he is firm in his insistence that in contemporary advanced industrial nations the working class will not revolt. In advanced countries political education in the form of radical enlightenment must proceed apace to create in the masses a break with the hold of the Established order over them.

> *Without this rupture, which can only be the result of political education in action, even the most elemental, the most immediate force of rebellion may be defeated, or become the mass basis of counter-revolution.*[8]

This work of political education centers, of course, in a cadre of young, vigorous intellectual leaders in the universities. But it must then spread to the vast ghetto populations surrounding the industrial centers of the great cities, the vital economic and political targets. Obviously, then, it is the urban universities which are most favorably located to serve a function in the climatic stages of Revolution. The younger radicalized intelligensia in the urban universities form ties with the ghetto populations in their areas, and the work of radicalization proceeds apace in the city slums under the continuing stimulation and guidance of university personnel. Such endeavor is of a part with correlative activities in the Third World. Political education means the enterprise of radicalization throughout the world.

As Marcuse saw it, the promise for the Revolutions of 1968 lay in the conjoint activities of younger intelligentsia, colored peoples of the Great Cities, and oppressed populations of the Third World. The dialectic moved in history; human affairs were construed in authentic Hegelian fashion as the working out of Reason in temporal process. But in contrast to classic Marxist analysis, the source of the negation was adjudged to be the young anti-Establishment scholars in the universities rather than angry young workers in the shops.

However we assess the specifics of this analysis, we do well to work more diligently than we have in the past to meet the Movement on intellectual grounds. We have had, in aspects of New Left theory, some very powerful ideas which need to be treated as such.

NOTES

1. Georges Pompidou. Quoted in *Facts on File*, XXVIII, 1438 (May 16-22, 1968), p. 203.
2. Herbert Marcuse, *An Essay on Liberation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.).
3. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 24.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 57.

A CRITIQUE OF LAWRENCE CREMIN'S AMERICAN EDUCATION: THE COLONIAL EXPERIENCE 1607–1783 and ITS ADAPTABILITY IN HISTORY OF AMERICAN EDUCATION COURSES

by

Sheldon S. Cohen
Associate Professor, History Department
Loyola University, Chicago

In the autumn of 1970 one of the most scholarly and significant books on the history of American education was published by Harper and Row. The work was entitled *American Education: The Colonial Experience, 1607-1783*, and the author was Professor Lawrence Cremin of Columbia Teachers College. Already noted for a prizewinning history of Progressive Education in the United States, Professor Cremin has now added more laurels to his distringuished career with this first of his projected three-volume study of the growth of American Education.

Since its appearance, Cremin's book has received an enthusiastic reception by its reviewers. Professor James Axtell of Yale has called it "monumental" and has predicted that in future years it will "remain as one of the finest achievements of its genre." Theodore Sizer, former dean of the Harvard School of Education, not only gives praise for Cremin's incisive descriptions of the "incredible diversity of schools and colleges that proliferated in the colonies," but he also finds in this work a "plea to those responsible for American education to ponder for our future, the qualities now lost that gave energy and hope to our forebears." Other prominent reviewers such as Professors Robert Middlehauff, Frederick Tolles and Rena Vasser have enthusiastically concluded that this volume represents the best history of colonial education to date.

The praise this book received is indeed justified. Cremin has chosen to follow the refreshingly broad-based approach to the scope and nature of education previously expounded by Professor Bernard Bailyn in his essay, *Education in the Forming of American Society*, published in 1960. It was Bailyn, you may recall, whose new outlook in the historiography of American education, helped replace the restrictive, institutional view of education which had largely dominated the subject since the publication in 1919 of Ellwood P. Cubberley's *Public Education in the United States*. In line with this recent revisionist trend, Cremin's volume finds much more in the meaning of education than mere schooling. Indeed, his preface offers us the expansive definition of education as the "deliberate, systematic, and sustained effort to transmit or evoke knowledge, attitudes, values, and sensibilities." As a result of this definition, Cremin has included a host of institutions other than schools that participate in the learning process: families, churches, libraries, museums, printing houses, benevolent societies, youth groups, military organizations, and voluntary institutes. His book also broadens the formerly limited scope of this topic by emphasizing such facets as the "modes and processes of education," the complex network of relationships between education and politics, and the impact of education on the American mind and character. In sum, the perplexing task of assembling and presenting this revisionist approach has been handled with remarkable insight and imagination.

Before discussing the question of the adaptability of Professor Cremin's book, I think that it would be in order to mention its organization and briefly summarize its contents. In structure, Cremin has followed the conventional trends of Colonial American historians. His study is divided into two sections, "Plantation" covering the period from 1607 to 1689, and, "Provincialism" tracing the years from 1689 to 1783. The earlier period was that which historians regard as formative; wherein an essentially English culture was transplanted to America. The latter period was that in which many disparate forces and events molded a new American culture, and a new American nation. In both sections Cremin also uses the conventional classification of American regional differences on the basis of New England, middle and southern colonies. The volume itself concludes with an excellent and informative Bibliographical Essay arranged on a chapter by chapter basis.

Professor Cremin's initial concern is with the manner in which European, and primarily English, educational theories and practices served to influence the first generations of colonial settlers. American colonists were unquestionably heirs of the late Renaissance traditions, and the book's first chapters are devoted to traditions such as piety, civility, and learning which encompassed the Anglo-American experience in the seventeenth century. The concepts of writers such as Erasmus, Montaigne, Sir Thomas More, Francis Bacon, Sir Thomas Elyot, John Colet, Petrus Ramus and others who helped form these traditions are summarized in order to exemplify the cultural heritage which the colonists brought with them to the new world. Establishing this intellectual background for the beginnings of colonial education is essential, for as Cremin correctly points out, "it is largely through these works the colonists carried with them, as well as through the books and pamphlets, and sermons and laws they wrote themselves, that we can best know what they understood, believed, valued, and aspired to."

In his description of the educational institutions which were established during this "Plantation" period, Professor Cremin begins with his focus on the family. Like Bernard Bailyn, he finds in the family the principal means through which the colonists adapted to the new pressures of the colonial environment. The colonial family, says Cremin, "for all its commitment to disciplining, civilizing, and spiritualizing children, managed within a single generation to work out and regularize new attitudes and behavior and to transmit these to the young."

This critical study of the educative effects of the colonial family is followed by chapters devoted to the churches, schools, Harvard College, and the colonial communities themselves. Unlike England where the established Episcopal Church had the legal power to act as an educational institution, Cremin notes that the churches in the colonies were more informal, and taught "in many voices." As for the schools themselves, he finds in the establishment of town and grammar schools in Massachusetts and the free schools of Virginia a "public concernment for education" throughout the early colonies.

The transit of liberal higher educational precepts from Oxford and

Cambridge to Harvard are traced, but in addition to these traditionally-oriented features, Cremin also shows us that the first English speaking college in the New World proved quite innovative in matters such as administration, financial support, and Indian education. After analyzing the importance of education within several communities in colonial America prior to 1689, Cremin reaches the conclusion at the close of his book's first section that overall educational achievements were greatest in the New England colonies.

Provincialism, the latter and lengthiest section of this volume, examines the period from 1689 to 1783. Politically, it covers the years from the aftermath of England's Glorious Revolution to the attainment of American independence. Economically, it marked the dynamic expansion of colonial trade, commerce, and industry from the circumscribed, mercantilist restrictions of the seventeenth century. And equally important, the period also marked a change from the basically derivative culture of the earliest American settlements.

Naturally, such far-reaching changes in colonial life were also reflected in education, and Cremin begins the latter section of his work examining the pedagogical aspects of eighteenth century religious transformations and the related growth of a utilitarian spirit. The pivotal event in religion is seen in the upheavals of the Great Awakening. Although piety and virtue continued to hold a central place in colonial education following the revival, Cremin shows that through men such as Jonathan Edwards and organizations such as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, both piety and virtue had become more revitalized, humanitarian, and practical. The increasing spirit of utilitarianism in eighteenth century America, which influenced these religious changes, is viewed not only in the colonists' spatial and material expanion, but also in the educational philosophy of men such as John Locke, William Smith, and most especially Benjamin Franklin. Cremin further shows us how the educational requisites for the increasingly diversified colonial livelihoods were achieved in varied ways; directly through newly established colleges, academies, and private schools, and indirectly through means such as almanacs, newspapers, and voluntary associations.

Cremin devotes the final chapters of his volume to the growing interaction between colonial politics and education, and the characteristics of colonial education at the conclusion of this provincial period. That politics and education were increasingly mixed is illustrated through such features as politicized newspapers, educative efforts of dissenting clergymen, and the appearance of courses in moral philosophy at several colonial colleges. By 1783 the nationalistic concept that education is fundamental to the success of American liberty is clearly evident in Thomas Jefferson's "Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge," and the first printing of Noah Webster's *American Spelling Book*. As for the status of education itself in 1783, Cremin offers his readers a very positive picture. He concludes that at least for white male youths, popular education was not only widely accessible, but it was also successful in procuring a high rate of literacy. In such respects colonial education by 1783 had truly come to express "the most profound impulses and hopes of American culture."

What I have offered thus far are my observations on the composition of Professor Cremin's work, which has just been reprinted by Harper's in a less costly paperback edition. What I would like to conclude with are my own sentiments on the merits of using this book as a classroom text.

As you might expect I would personally endorse adoption of this volume for graduate level courses covering the history of American education through 1789. During the past academic year I tested Cremin's book as my main text in such a one-semester course. My own findings were that the author's broad-based conception of education can indeed liberate the instructor from focusing his teaching simply on the narrow confines of institutional learning. It also offers the student a rather wide perspective not only of the various facets of education in colonial America, but also the manner in which educational forces were related to the development of colonial society. The comprehensive critical bibliography at the book's conclusion can be an extremely useful guide for student term paper topics. I would also suggest that since Bernard Bailyn's essay, *Education in the Forming of American Society* is available in an inexpensive paperback version, that it could be used in conjunction with Cremin's volume. I believe that in this way the students would be better able to comprehend the formation of recent revisionist trends in the history of American education.

I found only a few minor reservations in using Professor Cremin's text. For one thing, since the volume is written at a rather advanced level, I would strongly suggest that students enrolling in graduate courses covering this period be required to have taken an undergraduate course in American history which would encompass this era. The lack of a basic grasp of the development of American--especially colonial American--history, did prove a detriment to at least one student in my course. Another point that must be remembered, I think, is that while Cremin has accomplished a superb task in presenting and analyzing printed works of literate men such as John Locke, Benjamin Franklin, Cotton Mather, John Witherspoon and Jonathan Edwards, he sometimes neglects the educational traits and contributions of the less literate and often faceless pioneers. We can call to mind the African slaves and non-English speaking migrants as examples of such unrecollected pioneers. Finally, I would have to agree with the minor criticism of one reviewer that a somewhat "tighter organization, fewer introductions to introductions, and less discussion of tangential material would have made the book less repetitious and more readable."

Despite such minor reservations, this volume remains a tailor-made textbook for graduate level courses in the history of American education during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. I have noticed, however, that except for the larger schools of education, most universities seem to divide their graduate level history of American education offerings into two semester courses. The first semester usually comprises a period ending sometime after the Civil War while the latter semester course normally focuses on education in the twentieth century.

For those instructors offering the earlier course in this graduate level format, I would like to offer these suggestions. Until Professor Cremin's second volume is published, which will carry his projected study to the final decades of the nineteenth century, I would forego using his initial volume as the sole text for a course of this scope. Instead, my own preference would be to have the students study specific sections from the book. In particular, I would assign Cremin's chapters on learning practices in Tudor and early Stuart England, the educative role of the family in early America, colonial missionary activities, the growing spirit of utilitarianism in eighteenth century America, the interrelationship of politics and education, and finally the characteristics of education at the onset of American independence. Comparing Cremin's concepts to Ellwood Cubberley's increasingly antiquated writings would also add to the content of any graduate course covering the scope of American education.

There are other books which instructors might use to cover the post-Cremin years in these extensive graduate history of education courses. Bernard Bailyn's essay covers developments to the early nineteenth century, and despite some of their shortcomings, it might prove worthwhile to use some of the more recent histories which give good coverage of the common school movement in the nineteenth century. Two such books I would recommend are Newton Edwards and Herman G. Richey's, *The School in the American Social Order*, and Harry Good's *A History of American Education*. Thanks also to contemporary scholars such as Merle Curti and David Tyack, instructors also have available some good books which offer readings in the history of education in the United States.

Moving on to the undergraduate level I would generally tend to use Professor Cremin's volume on a limited basis. In a junior or senior level course on the history of American education to 1789, or even 1800, which had a course in early American history as prerequisite, I would probably use this book as my text. However, since most undergraduate courses covering the history of American education seem to be divided into a two or even one semester sequence, I would prefer to use particular readings from Cremin and Bailyn along with a more survey-oriented textbook. Most published works of this survey variety are in hardcover, but next year John Wiley and Sons will be publishing an inexpensive five-volume paperback set devoted to the entire scope of American educational history. Hopefully this series will fulfill our need for more up-to-date survey-level textbooks designed for undergraduate courses.

The matter of whether or how to use Professor Cremin's book in the classroom is, in the final analysis, a matter of the instructor's own preference. I do not feel, however, that these concerns should cloud the new pathways that this volume has opened for both students and teachers in the field of American educational history. The publication of *American Education: The Colonial Experience* is indeed the "first major assessment of the impact of American education on the American mind and character." It has also, in my opinion, helped bring the study of educational history to a distinctly more respectful status for serious-minded scholars of American educational history. In closing then, I can only say, let's get on with the work of building upon Lawrence Cremin's splendidly laid foundations, and discover what new structures can emerge to enhance our profession.

AMOS BRONSON ALCOTT: *TRANSCENDENTAL EDUCATOR*

by

David B. Ripley
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

Introduction

We often fail to recognize that as a friend of Emerson and Thoreau, as the father and teacher of Louisa May, and as an individual, A. Bronson Alcott made a considerable contribution to education in 19th century America. Despite his long life (1799-1888), his many teaching efforts, and his dedication to improving the schools, his efforts are often excluded from educational histories.

Through the excursions and twists of Alcott's thought ran a central theme to it. The child was always the focus of Alcott's interest, and the spirit was the director of all his investigations. When Alcott looked at a child he saw a soul, emmanating from God, and experiencing the realities of this physical world. To Alcott, education had to be individual, social, and spiritual, all at the same time. This necessitated enlarging the meaning of education to include the home, the community, and the spirit; it also necessitated revolt against Calvinist teachings regarding the innate depravity of children. Alcott did not hesitate on either count.

Alcott's implementations involve the application of his ideas to an educational environment: the most obvious are the redesign of furniture, the introduction of personal slates and blackboards, and the requirement of texts for every student. Each of these reflects the individual centered aspect of Alcott's thought. The social nature of his thought is reflected in opening the school to parents, collecting a school library of considerable merit, taking the students into the community for geography, and introducing physical exercises as a regular part of his school's instruction. Alcott's spiritual concern is indicated by his methodology of conversations as applied to such sources as Pilgrim's Progress or the Gospels. It is also reflected in his aversion to physical methods of discipline, relying instead on exclusion from the group or on social pressure. The spiritual aspect is also pointed out by his use of sculpture, paintings and flowers. These not only decorated the classroom thus forming a pleasing association, but also served as symbols of spiritual ideas. They were often brought into use to illustrate a point, or better still a moral. Clearly he merits consideration as an educational figure, not just as the father of Louisa May.

To illustrate his ideas and practices I have chosen to treat his Connecticut teaching experience as they reflect his ideas and implementations. This was prior to his encounters with Channing, Emerson, Fuller and Thoreau, and thus they speak more directly to the question of his being derivative to them.

From 1823 to 1828, A. Bronson Alcott was employed as a school teacher in various schools in Connecticut. He spent the winter term of 1823-24 at the Fall Mountain District in Bristol. In April, 1824, he and his brother Chatfield, walked to Paris, New York, to find employment in teaching. The absence of vacancies and Bronson's ill health caused their plans to be abandoned. In autumn 1824, Alcott ran a penmanship school of Wolcott, his home town. The winter term of 1824-25, found him back in Bristol, this time at the West Street School for four months.[1]

From November 1825, until June 1827, Alcott was schoolmaster at the "Centre" District School in Cheshire. This was by far his most successful school in Connecticut, based on enrollment, tenure, and amount of innovation. He had seventy students per day in February 1826; throughout most of his time in Cheshire he had at least thirty scholars. Under Alcott's leadership this school was known both as the Cheshire Pestalozzian School and the Cheshire Philosophical School.[2] Here he implemented many of his educational ideas and achieved a reputation as an excellent teacher. Even in Boston newspapers his name and school are mentioned witness this excerpt from the Boston Recorder.

> *There is one school of a superior or improved kind, namely Mr. A. B. Alcott's school in Cheshire, Conn. Our writer is satisfied that this is the best Common School in the State, perhaps in the United States.*[3]

In a letter to his brother Chatfield, Bronson describes the closing of this Cheshire School. "The school has been discontinued at my choice...I wished to avail myself of opportunities for visiting schools, seeing individuals taking an interest in them, extending my acquaintances and information, and finding a place for the winter."[4] Herrnstadt, however, reports that the closing of the school was probably due to the reopening of the Cheshire Academy (formerly run by Alcott's uncle, Tillotson Bronson), parental objections to Alcott's advanced teaching methods, and a competitive common school which opened May 21, 1827.[5]

Despite the closing of his school, Alcott was optimistic. His letter to Chatfield exudes confidence and hope.

> *...I am at present flattered by the prospects which are before me. Great interest is taken in the subject of Education, in various places which I have visited, and especially in Hartford. In this place there is a very favorable opportunity offered, which I shall probably secure. There is likewise a chance very favorable in New Haven...these opportunities exceed my expectations...*[6]

None of the Hartford or New Haven expectations worked out, so after traveling and observing and talking education throughout Connecticut, Alcott signed on again at the West Street School in Bristol. He stayed there for only the winter term of 1827-28. In May 1828, Alcott left Connecticut for Boston; he never again taught school in that state.[7]

The Connecticut teaching period of Alcott was the time of his most industrious educational experimentation. His subsequent experiences led to refinements and development, but the framework was tested and found firm during these years from 1823 to 1828. The ideas tried out ranged from physical changes in desks and seats to a plan for intellectual education, from proving individual students slates to implementing a school library, from physical education to moral training, from self-governing scholars to evening open houses for parents.[8] Yet some would still suggest that Alcott is not an educational reformer.

Physical Changes

To adequately consider each of Alcott's many ideas it is necessary to treat them individually rather than collectively. This first category, physical changes, deals with desks and seats, blackboards, slates, and the physical arrangement of the school room.

The question of the reconstruction of student desks and chairs or seats is raised in a letter to Alcott from John Peteres of the Bureau of Education, Washington, D.C. The letter is dated October 9, 1879, and its purpose is evident. "I beg to renew my request for a brief historic statement of the origin of the improvement in desks, black-boards, school furniture, etc., and the connection of yourself and your relative with it."[9] The relative referred to is Dr. William A. Alcott, a cousin and a long-time friend of Bronson. Dr. Alcott was a schoolmaster in Bristol during the period Alcott spent there in 1823-24 and again in 1824-25. The reply to Peter's request came in a letter from A. Bronson Alcott dated October 15, 1879.

> *...The most I can do now is forward to you Dr. Alcott's Prize Essay, On the Construction of School Houses, which is as much mine in its plan and details as his. The idea of the desks I believe, to be mine entirely, and first made and put into use in the Centre School House in Cheshire, Conn. in 1826. We had both taught school in Bristol before this date, and added backs to the rude benches, and introduced slates for the younger classes...I certainly had seen none of that pattern, and had these made at my own expense. The seats of the inner row of desks were with backs and intended for those who used slates only...*[10]

In the May 1827 issue of the *American Journal of Education*, there is an article authored by Dr. W. A. Alcott, which is a copy of the essay "On Construction of School Houses."[11] Both the articles author and A. Bronson Alcott are credited as co-creators of the new styled school furniture. Mr. Peters responded to Alcott's letter on October 21, 1879, confirming without exception Alcott's recollection of the events.

Alcott mentions in his "Journal"[13] that the first year he was at Cheshire, was one period when he did not try to change things. He intended to get to know his students, their parents, and the community. Yet despite this "going along" he did change some things. "Within the first year of his service there he managed to get the schoolroom thoroughly renovated and 'fitted out' with blackboards, slates and desks, all at his own expense."[14] These physical changes were not an end in themselves, but were rather the means by which Alcott could begin to organize instruction after his inductive pattern. "Slates were introduced as blackboards, the first in any public school in Connecticut. But Alcott knew, such physical changes could only aid, they could not produce the effect he wanted."[15] In all of Alcott's Connecticut schools, except the final term at Bristol, these changes were paid for by him. At Bristol, the School Committee had already incorporated the individual desks, blackboards, and student slates into the room.

The physical changes, though important, were for Alcott, secondary to the intellectual purposes they were designed to facilitate. Alcott individualized instruction because he believed in the concepts of individual worth and innate goodness. He believed that children, even the youngest, had minds of their own, and should be encouraged to use them. For Alcott, physical comfort in the school's facilities was conducive to personal and moral growth.

School Library and Books

The letter collection which Alcott amassed during his life is stored in Houghton Library of Harvard University. One letter from these volumes is written to A. Bronson Alcott from Mr. U. T. Curran, Ohio Superintendent of Schools. It is dated May 9, 1879. In it Mr. Curran asks Alcott to go over a list of children's books adding or deleting as he sees fit. The purpose is to create a recommended list of children's books for the Ohio schools. Alcott's advice is solicited as expert testimony.

Fifty-three years before this letter was written, Alcott was deeply involved in a similar project for his rural school in Connecticut. He was concerned first of all with textbooks. It would seem that if he were to apply inductive principles and use concrete illustrations, if he were to begin with the simple and move toward the complex, there would have to be some uniformity of textbooks among his students. The traditional practice was to have one set of texts for all members of a family, with no requirement that all families have the same texts. After consulting the *American Journal of Education*, Alcott chose his textbooks. They were mostly purchased by the parents, albeit somewhat reluctantly. He chose *Child's Arithmetic* by Fowle, *Primer* by Worcester, *Primer* by Franklin, *Easy Lessons* by Leavitt, *Intellectual Arithmetic* by Warren Colburn, *Geography* by Woodbridge and Willard, and *Rational Guide to Orthography* by Fowle.[16]

One might readily notice the absence of Webster's *Speller* and Dwight's *Geography*. Their absence was neither frivolous nor by chance. Alcott's approach to geography was to start with the known and move toward the unknown. Dwight's traditional approach did not support such revised ideas. Alcott included defining as a major part of a spelling exercise. Knowledge of how to spell a word without being able to use it in a sentence or to give examples of its meaning made no sense for Alcott. Webster's *Speller* was therefore discarded.

The library used by scholars, patrons, and Alcott, came to more than two hundred volumes. The collection was housed in the schoolhouse. Of primary interest is that of the one hundred eighty-five volumes intended for the scholars, at least twenty-three were story books. A sampling of titles convey their nature: *Basket Woman*, *Broken Flute*, *Cock Robin*, *Dancing Bear*, *&c.*, *New Robinson Crusoe*, and *A Riddle Book*. Aside from children's story books and textbooks, there were two children's journals included: *Juvenile Miscellany* for 1826-27, and *Youth' Gazette* for 1827.

For the instructor and the parents there was the *American Journal of Education*. Alcott thought highly of this periodical; writing of it: "To the *Journal of Education* are we indebted for the first-correct-direction of our thoughts on the great subject of Education."[17] He hoped the parents would find it equally instructive. Among the adult books were Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding*, Owen's *New View of Society*, the *Epitome of Pestalozzian Instruction* by William Maclure, and *Hints to Parents*, author unknown. Available in the community, but not listed among the school's collection are books by Milton, Darwin, Bacon and Cowper. This conclusion is made on the basis that Alcott records having read them in 1827.[18]

This represents a remarkably diverse library for a poor rural community in the hills of Connecticut. Alcott naturally was not solely responsible, but that the credit is mostly his seems clear. The idea of individual reading materials provided by the school for use at home by scholars and patrons is unusual for this the first quarter of the 19th century. A case could be made that even today the idea of an elementary school library is not wholly accepted. Last year, for example, a National School Bell Award was granted the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Public Schools in recognition of their efforts to implement libraries in their elementary grades. One is almost tempted to comment on "rediscovering the wheel."

Physical Training

In a current article attempting to make Alcott the educational and philosophical disciple of Emerson, the general idea is presented that Alcott was a strict disciplinarian, forcing students to conform to severe behavioral codes of silence and stillness.[19] In terms of today's "open school" ideas there may be a modicum of truth in that belief. When looked at through contemporary eyes (contemporary to Alcott that is) it is found that Alcott introduced remarkable freedom to the classroom. Alcott was aware of the criticisms and controversy this freedom provoked, but, he was convinced that the worthwhile nature of his goals justified his experiments.

In reference to his Cheshire summer term in 1826, Alcott pens these comments in his "Journal" under the title of General Observations.

> *During the term herein mentioned, a part of which was a course of experiment to ascertain the effect of plans and etc. upon the young mind, the following facts seem to be settled.*

> 1. *The value of arrangement in study.*
> 2. *The uselessness of the rod in discipline.*
> 3. *The superior influence of the affections in government.*
> 4. *The value of mildness and gentleness in habit and disposition.*
> 5. *The advantage of variety in exercise.*
> 6. *The superiority of explanation and illustration.*
> 7. *The stimulus given by physical exercise.*[20]

For the purpose of this section on Physical Training, particular attention should be paid to items five and seven; varied exercise is stimulating to the students.

By May 1, 1827, Alcott had developed his view of physical training considerably. He had implemented a variety of games and exercises into his program and had even given considerable thought to playground activities that would foster the skills and attitudes he considered important. Through all of these experiments he was attempting to foster worthwhile learning experiences, while building on the natural interests and enthusiasms of the students. His "Journal" expresses this view under the title, "Physical Arrangements."

> *A different arrangement has been made in the interior of the School-Room, by which more space is given for physical exercises. The whole room is now open for sports. In these almost all now engage, with much apparent satisfaction. Our object in these amusements is to improve the bodily powers, and to cultivate the affections, giving them a moral tone.... During summer it is contemplated, to increase the interest taken in this exercise, as well as to promote the health of the children, by having it conducted in the open air, near the vicinity of the school-room. We intend likewise to furnish blocks of wood, resembling bricks, which the children can use in building bridges, houses, pyramids, forts, &c., as may suit their taste and ingenuity....*
>
> *Whenever action is concerned, these children are pleased to be; and he who would control them successfully must bear this principle in his mind constantly, and direct his measures accordingly.*[21]

This lengthy citation convincingly states some rather modern views on curriculum and learning experiences. No doubt Alcott was "prim and proper" in some regards, yet his views on physical exercise and making use of student interests could be regarded as "progressive" today. His was not a view of exercise for its own sake. As he said: "We value them mostly on account of their moral and physical influence."[22]

Community Schools

Alcott believed that the school was the center of learning for the pupils. There is nothing new or unusual in this thought. But Alcott also believed that the school should be a center of learning and social life for the parents and the community. We have seen that the library facilities of the school were opened to the students and parents; this was also true of the physical facilities of the school. Alcott encouraged the students to join together in games and recreation at a kind of evening social; he even joined them in their sport.

Alcott envisioned the school as a social and educational center which would serve to unite the members of the community who heretofore were separated by vocational influence, religious bias, and tradition.

> *That, while the inhabitants of a village have been trained in so many different ways; are employed in so many different vocations, insultated from each other; while in short each considers it his bounden duty to consult his own apparent and immediate self-interests, regardless of its influence on that of his neighbor; harmonious cooperation in any measure calculated to enhance the collective good of man cannot be expected.... To act for the collective good is a principle, of which such men have no conception.... Individual, not collective good, is the measure of their mind and conduct.*[23]

One way to counteract this social fragmentation was to build around the school. As Alcott advocated building the educational program of the school upon the interests of the students, so he felt that community cooperation could be structured upon the natural interests of the parents in their children's schooling. Shepard reports Alcott's efforts toward this purpose.

> *By the beginning of 1827 he had established evening classes and regular social gatherings of parents and children at the school-house, and was giving one evening a week to the entertainment of his pupils and their parents at his boarding place.*[24]

Pedagogy

"Pedagogy" has long been a term describing the methods and theories governing the instructive process. It is derived from the Greek word for the slave who accompanied the student to his school carrying his books. One of the pedagogue's responsibilities was to protect the student from untoward experience with the real world encircling him. The word had an appropriate fitness for centuries of educational methodology. Carry the books of knowledge to the scholar; isolate the pupil from the reality of himself and his world; protect the child from moral shock; all these come to mind. Alcott made strenuous attempts to change this pedagogic quality of educational instruction.

His teaching efforts in Connecticut are based on two assumptions: men are by nature equal; and men, or at least children, are basically good. The motto Alcott chose for his school, "Education is All," contains a hint of these two underlying assumptions. If one really believes these two premises, men are both equal and good, it can lead quite readily to placing education in a supreme position. Education, can then by the proper structure and functioning preserve the equality and goodness thus reforming and elevating mankind. The teacher can be the means of creating the brotherhood of man which Jesus taught. Alcott believed those implications.

The belief in the equality of man was no doubt part of the intellectual climate of the early 19th century. In Alcott it was to assume a freshness and intensity that distinguished him. Robert Owen's *New View of Society*, read by Alcott at this time, likely had some influence on his convictions. Owen, in this collection of essays, discusses the influence of environment upon character and the possibility of the regeneration of man. It was Owen's belief that children collectively may be taught any sentiment or habit or trained to acquire any character.[25] Alcott reacted enthusiastically to this book. In his "Journal" for October, 1827, he wrote: "Robert Owen's system and principles would soon become general, they would be the precursor of a happier day on the globe, and the the power of man could not prevent them from being universally embraced."[26] It is interesting to note, and indicative of Alcott's development, that two years later, in December 1829, Alcott penciled beside the passage this comment: "Zeal without knowledge" Five years later in March 1832, he added another remark: "Want of discrimination."[27]

Alcott's belief in the innate goodness of man was hardly typical of the feelings of rural New Englanders at this time. At his last Connecticut school, West Street in Bristol, the controversy causing Alcott's departure after one term was clearly theological. Alcott denied the divinity of Christ and yet revered Jesus as the greatest teacher and the perfect model of human existence.

His use of Jesus as a model for teachers was not limited to Bristol, but was constant throughout his career. As Alcott began his teaching in Cheshire he wrote a list of fifty-eight General Maxims which he intended as a guide to "regulate the instructor's practice in instruction."[28] Four of these maxims deal specifically with Christianity and Jesus; many others deal with Christian ethics in a general sense. McCuskey, in summing up Alcott's Connecticut experiences stresses the primacy of Scriptural influence as the key to Alcott's educational ideas.[29]

The influence of William Russell, a native of Scotland and the editor of the *American Journal of Education*, in a real sense bridges the Christian influence and the Pestalozzian influence. Russell not only combines these two sources, but adds to it a framework of practical school experience. Alcott and Russell were to be lifelong friends and correspondents, so this influence upon Alcott's educational ideas and experiments was to endure. That Russell's periodical influenced Alcott toward Pestalozzi is quite probable, if not certain. A search of it for the years 1826 and 1827 reveals two clearly Pestalozzian articles.[30] Other evidence mainly consists of books Alcott read, people he respected in education, and comments he made in his "Journal" of these years. Two books by men who had been closely associated with Pestalozzi were ready by Alcott almost as soon as he began to teach: Joseph Neef's *Sketch of a Plan and Method in Education*, and Hermann Krusi's *Coup-D'Oeil on the General Means of Education*. These are both considered to be reliable reports by authors closely associated with Pestalozzi.

William Alcott, the cousin, was a friend and associate of the Reverend William C. Woodbridge of Hartford. Woodbridge had spent some time at Hofwyl, Switzerland, in the school founded by Fellenberg, a man deeply influenced by Pestalozzi. Dr. J. M. Keagy was a Swiss physician conducting a Pestalozzian school at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Alcott was familiar with his book on methods of education and in April, 1826, Keagy wrote Alcott a letter on the principles and methods of Pestalozzi. In November of that same year, William Maclure of the Pestalozzian School at New Harmony, Indiana sent Alcott a four page letter on the same topic.[31] In May of 1828, while in Philadelphia, Alcott purchased a book written by J. P. Greaves: *Exposition of the Principles of Conducting Infant Education*. Greaves, an Englishman, had spent considerable time at Yverdun; he was a fervent admirer of Pestalozzi, and his book reflects this admiration. These citations should be sufficient to show that Alcott was far from ignorant of the theories and practices evolved by Pestalozzi.[32]

Although Alcott at one time called his school the Cheshire Pestalozzi School, it would be wrong to place too much stress on this discipleship. Alcott was not then and never did become very successful in a subordinate relationship. Alcott considered his efforts to be adapted from both the Lancastrian idea of monitorial schools and from Pestalozzi's teachings as reported in the various sources he had available.

> *Ordinarily our schools, it is thought, are much too large. On the* **Lancastrian,** *or* **mutual** *plan of Instruction, however, the circumstance of number, is of advantage: many are essential to this system. Highly as we think of these systems however, we would not blindly follow in them. We are better pleased with the* **Pestalozzian** *or Philosophical method. The union of the former to some extent with the latter would we think compose a system uniting dispatch, thoroughness, and accuracy of Instruction in a permanent manner.*[33]

Before closing, a look at some of the actual practices Alcott used in the classroom is warranted. Their importance is to help us judge how effectively Alcott was able to implement his fusion of influences. These techniques were to remain the basic bricks of Alcott's teaching for a variety of subsequent educational experiences. The key word for understanding his approach is "inductive." He started with the known and moved toward the unknown: understanding of the little bit of God in each individual leads to understanding the universe. Though Alcott uses the term "inductive," today's vernacular might well be micro-macrocosm.

The reading program in Alcott's Connecticut schools began by associating pictures of animals with their names: dog, cat, cow. Intermixed was work on sounds; sometimes hissing and buzzing could be fun. Once the children had learned to distinguish sounds and had acquired a small vocabulary of words, then they might begin defining. Alcott placed great importance on the understanding that while words were only symbols, they had a meaning. Whenever the word was read, the idea of it or the meaning of it went with it. Alcott's painstaking efforts in this area were designed to eliminate the ability to call out words quickly and correctly, but with no understanding of their meaning.

It has been mentioned earlier that Alcott discarded the Webster *Speller* in favor of Fowle's *Rational Guide to Orthography*. Mr. Fowle, it might be noted, was the master of a well-known monitorial school in Boston. Alcott had no use for spelling lists as such. His spelling words were found in the reading or geography lessons, in the library books, the Scriptures, or in anything the child might read. The children soon discovered, according to Alcott, that spelling is merely deliberate reading. •

For arithmetic, Alcott discarded the traditional methods of copybooks full of problems and corresponding answer books, or definitions to be memorized. In their place he put beans and blocks of wood for the children to hold, count, and arrange in patterns. All the students had slates on which to make numbers, draw geometrical figures, and solve problems of a practical and immediate nature. From number drawing to writing was an easy step. Writing was never a separate subject in his school at Cheshire. As the children learned to write words, their qualities were pointed out, sentences were analyzed and, almost without knowing it, the child was learning the rudiments of functional grammar. Often a lesson which started out as an analysis of Scripture might end as a study of grammar, or the opposite.

Geography began with a map of the schoolyard, then the streets and houses the students knew; later they would go into surrounding woods and fields for study. Students were taught to use and keep a journal as a practical exercise in composition and grammar. Their journals were also used to record the number of ideas gained from various subjects. They served also as a record of the student's own moral tendencies. On Saturday mornings these would be used as a basis for discussion of moral issues and thus replaced a study of the Catechism. These discussions often served to further the self-government of the class by relating moral discussion to class behavior. The explanation of the Bible in terms related to the students' private lives as part of Alcott's curriculum. It was believed by Alcott that the religion of children, if not of men, consists in the practice of morality, at any rate the latter is a stepping-stone to the former.[34]

Summary

The efforts of Alcott in Bristol and Cheshire were recognized in his day as successful educational reform. Through the passage of time they have been generally forgotten, and yet they were important. The use of beans and blocks of wood for beginning arithmetic was to be systematized and promoted by Montessori. The idea of experiment as a determinant of truth was to become a major element of John Dewey's philosophy. The concept of reforming society through education is a major plant of the platform of educational reconstructionists. It is not within the scope of this paper to trace these present ideas to their historical origins. It is, however, one purpose of this paper to justify a place for Amos Bronson Alcott in the history of education. To that end these efforts seem warranted.

Alcott spent only four years, a relatively short time, in Connecticut schools. He was closed out of Bristol and Cheshire by parental opposition and clerical indignation. Yet his educational practices were anchored in the soundness of Pestalozzi and Jesus, his character was never questioned, and his desire to work diligently for the benefit of children was clearly evident. He left Connecticut after his final term at Bristol and in April 1828 went to Boston. In his "Journal for 1829" he listed an induction derived from his experiences: "In introducing improvements, great care is required to graduate their introduction to the state of common opinion." This was a bit of wisdom which he had taken thirty years to learn. He was to forget it all too soon.

FOOTNOTES

1. Houghton Library, Harvard, Alcott MSS, Letter Books, Vol. I, 1814-1828.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Boston Recorder*, May 11, 1827 (There are no page numbers on the excised copy consulted.)

4. Letter Books, Vol. I, *op. cit.*, July 10, 1827.

5. Richard L. Herrnstadt, *The Letters of A. Bronson Alcott* (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1969), p. 16.

6. Letter Books, Vol. I, *op. cit.*, July 10, 1827.

7. *Ibid., passim.*

8. Paul Monroe, ed., *A Cyclopedia of Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1911). Will S. Monroe, "Amos Bronson Alcott," pp. 83-4.

9. Houghton Library, Harvard, Alcott MSS, Letter Books, Vol. XXI, 1879, October 9.

10. Herrnstadt, *op. cit.*, p. 782.

11. William A. Alcott, "On the Construction of School Houses," *American Journal of Education*, Vol. II, May, 1827, pp. 26-34, 86-94.

12. Letter Books, Vol. XXI, *op. cit.*, October 21, 1879.

13. Quotation marks will be used to identify Alcott's unpublished works such as his Journal, Letter Books, and Autobiographical Collection.

14. Odell Shepard, *Pedlar's Progress: The Life of Bronson Alcott* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), p. 96.

15. Dorothy McCuskey, *Bronson Alcott, Teacher* (New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1969), p. 26.

16. Houghton Library, Harvard, Alcott MSS, Journal for 1826-27, pp. 164-5.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 1.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 2.

19. Thomas P. Pietras, "Amos Bronson Alcott: A Transcendental Philosophy of Education," *Educational Theory*, Vol. 21, No. 1, Winter, 1971, pp. 105-11.

20. Journal for 1826-27, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 129.

22. Journal for 1826-27, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 123.

24. *Pedlar's Progress*, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-7.

25. McCuskey, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

26. Journal for 1826-27, *op cit.*, p. 177.

27. *Ibid.*

28. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

29. McCuskey, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-9.

30. *Ibid.*, p. 36.

31. Houghton Library, Harvard, Alcott MSS, Autobiographical Collection for 1823-24, Vol. III, November 25, 1826.

32. *Pedlar's Progress, op. cit.*, pp. 84-5.

33. Journal for 1826-27, *op cit.*, p. 123.

34. McCuskey, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-32, *passim*.

35. *Pedlar's Progress, op. cit.*, p. 110.

EDUCATION AND INDUSTRIAL SKILLS: CHANGING CONCEPTIONS OF THE ROLE OF PUBLIC SCHOOLING 1865–1900*

by

B. Edward McClellan
Indiana University

*This paper is based on informal remarks made at the 1971 meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society. The analysis has been substantially revised.

"Circumstances have greatly changed since the planting of the seed which has grown into the mighty tree known as the public-school system," M. A. Newell proclaimed in his presidential address to the National Educational Association in 1877, "I have time to specify two only of these changes--the abolition of apprenticeship and the extensive introduction of machinery, accompanied by its necessary result, a minute subdivision of labor."[1] In focusing on industrialization and the differentiation it brought, Newell identified the sources of the most perplexing problem faced by those who shaped education in the last third of the nineteenth century. That problem was to determine how the public school could teach skills required by the industrial order without abandoning its traditional oldigations to perpetuate a common morality and serve as a cohesive force in the society.

The prosperity of mechanized society, schoolmen knew, depended on the existence of a large number of highly skilled managers and laborers. "The day of muscle in industry has passed," declared Ohio educator Emerson E. White, "and the day of the mind, with skill of eye and hand has dawned."[2] "The simplicity of rural life demanding no highly trained talent in carrying out its processes, observed another schoolman, "is rapidly changing into a complex urban life with varied and urgent demands for a wider and a higher education."[3] Yet, at a time when the demand for skilled workers was increasing, American children found it difficult to prepare for industrial pursuits. No longer was it common for them to acquire their skills informally as they matured. Nor could large numbers of them expect to learn useful skills through apprenticeships. "This increasing demand for better work," said White, "has been attended by a steady decline of the apprentice-system, which hitherto has been our chief reliance for the training of artisans."[4]

The apparent inability of other institutions to teach the skills required by mechanized production created growing pressures for the public school to assume a greater burden in preparing children for their occupations. To teach vocational skills, however, required a dramatic departure from the traditional functions of schooling, and late nineteenth-century reformers found it difficult to revise their assumptions about the central purpose of public education. As heirs of Horace Mann, they valued a schooling that emphasized basic skills of literacy and taught fundamental moral principles. They assumed that such training, when given to all students on an equal basis, made the school a powerful democratic and cohesive force in the society, and they feared innovations that might weaken the school's ability to provide equality of opportunity or offer a unifying moral education.

More than institutional conservatism lay behind the reluctance of schoolmen to undertake radical reforms. Many were convinced that industrialization itself intensified the need for a unifying moral education. Indeed, the very process that created the demand for new skills re-enforced the fears of social conflict that had given the public school its original character. Mechanization may have held the promise of abundance, but it also threatened to create a highly stratified society with dangerous possibilities of a new feudalism or of severe class divisions. Educators were especially alarmed by the prospect of class conflict. "The great danger in our country," A. D. Mayo the N. E. A. in 1876, "is an alien class apart from the body of the Republic, at the mercy of the political, social, or religious demagogue."[5] "A mob spirit is abroad in the land," warned another schoolman. "Perchance it is only a spark, but that spark, being essentially contagious and progressive, must be extinguished, or it will soon become a mighty conflagration."[6] An unprecedented wave of strikes in the eighties and nineties, a late-century influx of immigrants, and the spread of urban poverty aggravated an already intense fear of conflict.

Unable to embrace a view of society that accepted either conflict or rigid stratification, educators sought to develop programs that would at once teach practical skills and ameliorate growing social divisions. For men who assumed that cohesion required the preservation of a common culture and inculcation of common moral principles, that task was overwhelming. If the school were to teach industrial skills, moral education, as it had traditionally been defined, would inevitably receive less attention. Furthermore, in a society where skills were so diverse, any effort to prepare children for specific occupations would require that the school abandon its tradition of offering the same training to all children. If, on the other hand, the school were to emphasize moral education and teach only those skills that would be of equal value to all classes, training would have to be relatively remote from occupational pursuits that were becoming increasingly specialized.

The efforts of schoolmen to restructure their views in light of the conflicting needs of an industrial order constitute an important chapter in the history of American educational thought. Study of their efforts not only helps explain the transformation of education in the late nineteenth century, but also reveals much about a broader crises of values in American life during an era of bewildering change. This paper attempts to explore the nature of that crisis by focusing on the thought of one group of educational reformers, namely those men who believed that public schools should adopt the Della Vos system of manual and mechanical training.

The particular scheme of manual training proposed by these reformers had been developed by Victor Della Vos for use in Russian technical schools. The Della Vos system assumed that the principal trades involved a limited number of manual and mechanical skills which could be analyzed, abstracted, and taught in a series of graded exercises. Because it made "the art and not the trade fundamental," it seemed ideal for an industrial society that required flexibility among its skilled workers. Furthermore, since the skills were taught "by purely educational methods" rather than by the slow, imitative processes characteristic of apprenticeship, the program could be incorporated into the schools with little difficulty.[7]

The Della Vos system was first used in the United States by John D. Runkle, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Runkle had discovered the program while viewing the exhibits of the Imperial Technical Schools of St. Petersburg and Moscow at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition in 1876. Quick to recognize the significance of the Russian system, he immediately opened instruction shops for engineering students and a separate School of Mechanic Arts for "those who wish to enter upon industrial pursuits, rather than to become scientific engineers."[8] Organized along the lines suggested by the exhibits of the Della Vos system, the School of Mechanic Arts offered a course of study designed to teach the essential skills involved in working with wood, iron, and textiles:

> *In* **wood**—*I. Carpentry and joinery; II. Wood-turning; III. Patternmaking. In* **iron**—*I. Vise-work; II. Forging; III. Foundry-work; IV. Machine-tool work. In* **textiles**—*I. Designing; II. Pattern-weaving; III. Dyeing.*[9]

Convinced that manual training offered "the only true and philosophical key to all industrial education," Runkle urged the Massachusetts Board of Education to create other schools of mechanic arts in large cities and add some shop training to the regular high school programs in smaller cities.[10]

Although Runkle was the first to recognize the possibilities of the manual training idea, it was Calvin M. Woodward of St. Louis who became its greatest evangelist in America. Like Runkle, Woodward came to his interest in manual training through work in advanced technical education. A professor of mathematics at Washington University and a teacher in the university's O'Fallon Polytechnic School, Woodward encountered the problem that was bothering so many of his colleagues: his students were incapable of handling the most elementary tool work. Convinced that the difficulty lay in the inadequate training of the public schools, he persuaded Chancellor William G. Eliot to create a manual training school as a separate preparatory branch of the university. Financed largely by local businessmen, the school opened in 1879 with Woodward as its director.[11]

From the first Woodward set out to build not simply a preparatory school for the polytechnic but a model for a new kind of secondary education. He constructed a curriculum that combined liberal studies and tool instruction in a way which would make the training universally useful. The course of studies ran for three years along five parallel lines: Pure Mathematics (algebra, geometry, and trigonometry); Science and Applied Mathematics (physical geography, botany, natural philosophy, chemistry, mechanics, mensuration, and bookkeeping); Language and Literature (English grammar, spelling, composition, literature, history, political science and economy, with Latin and French as electives); Drawing (penmanship, freehand and mechanical drawing); and Tool Work (carpentry, wood turning, molding, brazing, soldering, forging, bench and machine work). Time was divided equally between "mental" and "manual" subjects, with one hour a day devoted to drawing, two hours to shopwork, and three hours to the liberal arts courses.[12]

It was Woodward's program that transformed a rather diffuse agitation for skills education into a well-defined movement. Industrialists looking for master mechanics, pedagogues unhappy with the formalism of traditional schooling, and a variety of social reformers joined to promote the manual training school as an alternative to the kind of classical secondary education that was beginning to emerge in the late nineteenth century. More important, many of these reformers, including Woodward himself, urged that certain manual training courses be introduced in the upper grade of the elementary school.[13] A few even suggested that a carefully graduated program of manual training begin in the kindergarten. William B. Powell, superintendent of schools in Washington, D. C., for example, proposed a course of study that included freehand drawing and clay modelling in the early grades, mechanical drawing in the middle grades, and carpentry and metal work in the last three years of the elementary school.[14] Despite the variety of specific proposals, most reformers agreed that manual training courses should begin in the late elementary years and continue through the entire high school program. Children who were able to complete the full course of studies, they believed, would have the necessary training to become skilled mechanics or enter the polytechnic schools. Those who could not afford to attend school beyond the eighth grade, on the other hand, would at least have enough knowledge of mechanical drawing and elementary tool work to qualify as skilled laborers.

Woodward and his followers saw their program as an efficient and inexpensive way of training "the vast army of workmen" required by mechanized production.[15] "What West Point is to the army," declared Augustus Jacobson, a founder of the Chicago Manual Training School,

> *the Manual Training School will become to industry, and more, because it will train not only the officers of industry, but likewise the rank and file. When this shall come to pass there will be no tariff agitation in this country, because the skill developed will of itself forever put an end to all foreign competition on American soil.*[16]

To ambitious children of laboring classes, the reformers claimed, manual training courses would offer an education that prepared them for the occupations they were most likely to undertake. The old education had either forced students into already crowded professions or diverted them from the schools entirely. By training the eye and hand as well as the mind, manual training would equip students with the skills to follow purely industrial pursuits. "I have no doubt...." Woodward said,

> *that many who otherwise would eke out a scanty subsistence as clerks, bookkeepers, salesmen, poor lawyers, murderous doctors, whining preachers, abandoned penny-a-liners, or hardened schoolkeepers, will be led, through the instrumentality of our school, to positions of honor and comfort as mechanics, engineers, or manufacturers.*[17]

Training would be specific enough to allow the student to move directly into skilled trades, but general enough to allow him to adapt to technological change:

> *If thrown out of one employment by the invention of a machine, the graduates of a Manual Training School can easily turn to any other employment. The boy who has learned the use of all the tools has found his bias, if he has any, and he can then go in the direction in which he is at his best. He need not go all through life working at a trade for which he is ill-fitted.* [18]

In a time when other forms of education, both formal and informal, ignored the special needs of the laboring classes, manual training programs would become the indispensable source of the very skills required by mechanized production.[19]

Advocates of manual training clearly expected their scheme to have special value to those who would become mechanics. At the same time, however, they went to extraordinary lengths to avoid a caste education and to preserve the democratic and unifying elements of traditional schooling. Thus, even as they implied the special relevance of manual training to ambitious children of laboring classes, they argued the universal applicability of their program. They talked not of special education but of a new kind of general education that was broad enough to keep open all avenues of mobility. "No education," Woodward contended,

> *can be "free" which leaves the child no choice or which gives a bias against any honorable occupation; which walls up the avenues of approach to any vocation requiring intelligence and skill. A truly liberal education educates equally for all spheres of usefulness; it furnishes the broad foundation on which to build the superstructure of a happy, useful, and successful life.* [20]

Since only the basic industrial skills were taught, students were not limited to particular trades. Nor were they confined to strictly mechanical pursuits. "Our school," said Woodward,

> *is not managed on the assumption that every boy who goes through it will work as a mechanic, or that he will be a manufacturer. Our graduates will doubtless find their true callings, and we prejudice them against none.*[21]

Enough literary and scientific studies were included in the curriculum to allow students to prepare for the professions if they wished. Nearly a third of the graduates of the St. Louis Manual Training School, Woodward noted in 1889, had entered colleges or polytechnic schools and many of them were studying for careers in law, medicine, and dentistry.[22]

Manual training, the reformers asserted, was of value to all students whether or not they would ever labor with their hands. Men who lived in an industrial civilization needed to understand the workings of the system of production and manual training contributed to that understanding in a way that remote general studies could not. In the shop the student became familiar with the basic tools and essential processes involved in all mechanized production. Through the courses in drawing he learned "the universal language" of industry.[23] Furthermore, he learned not by study of "vague generalizations and shadowy abstractions," but by practice and experience.[24] "The things we really **know**," said Woodward, "are not the things we have merely read about or heard about, but the things we have lived, have experienced, have been sensible of."[25] By allowing students to participate in the basic processes of production, the reformers maintained, the manual training school offered a unique way of mastering the bewildering complexity of industrial society.

While manual training broadened the knowledge of the student, it also broadened his abilities by "disciplining all his faculties." Traditional schooling had trained only a few of the capacities of the child. "There is," declared one educator sympathetic to manual training,

> *something incongruous and almost paradoxical in the fact that while education is professedly based upon psychology and psychology has ever since Locke been emphasizing the importance of the senses in the development of mental activity, nevertheless sense-training is accorded but a narrow corner in the school-room, and even that grudgingly. Industrial education is a protest against this mental oligarchy, the rule of a few faculties. It is a demand for mental democracy in which each power of mind, even the humblest, shall be permitted it occupy the place that is its due.*[26]

"School systems have too long put asunder what God had joined together," charged another critic of the old education.[27] The manual training program, on the other hand, "put the whole boy in school," and educated all of his God-given human faculties and sympathies symmetrically."[28] "[W]e have endeavored," wrote Woodward,

> *to bring together the education of the hand and the education of the mind, in such a way that each is the gainer thereby. And we have found it possible to bring together into one the two educations which some have thought it necessary to separate.*[29]

Even the "purely manual elements" in the curriculum promoted "dexterity of thought" as well as "dexterity of the hand" since they developed the powers of observation, attention, and precision.[30] "The supreme end of manual training, as of all education," said John E. Bradley,

> *is the harmonious development of the entire human being. Manual dexterity is an indication of a certain kind of mental power; and the mental power is developed along with the dexterity.*[31]

Keeping the boy whole was a part of a larger effort by the advocates of manual training to preserve the integrity and moral character of the individual in an age when specialization and mechanization threatened to erode the essential values of the past. Applying the legacy of the pre-Civil War manual labor movement led by Theodore Weld, the reformers emphasized the role of handwork in the development of virtue. "The finest fruit of all education," said Woodward, "is character; and the more complete and symmetrical, the more perfectly balanced the education, the better the fruit."[32] The exercises of the workshop taught the lessons of "industry, perseverance, and genuineness."

> *Manual training strengthens the will. It gives specific direction and force to every mental act. The boy acquires in the workshop the habit of overcoming difficulties and persisting in an undertaking till it is crowned with success. He conquers his sluggish tendency to do things carelessly.*[33]

"The pupils are so earnest," Woodward said of his students, "so impressed with the value of what they are receiving, that mischief and foolishness seem rather out of place."

> *Out of school hours, its influence is equally marked. Parents report that the school interests affect the boy's choice of recreations. The student generally has an auxiliary laboratory at home where he spends a good share of his spare time. The boy's mind as well as his hand is occupied, and Satan finds it hard to gain a listening ear or an idle hand.*[34]

By teaching the children the value of work, the reformers argued, manual training contributed to the unifying power of the school. Children preparing for the professions learned to respect the dignity of manual labor, while those who would follow industrial pursuits learned the skills necessary to survive honestly in the industrial society. "One thousand Manual Training Schools in the land would solve not only the question of strikes and lockouts," declared Jacobson, "but they would solve the whole capital and labor problem."

> *For boys educated in the Manual Training Schools there will be no capital and labor problem. Wherever they go they will be able to achieve for themselves their due share of the good things of this work. What we need to solve the problem is not a communistic distribution of property, which would not do it; but what we must have to solve the capital and labor problem effectually and permanently is the greatest possible distribution of individual power and individual ability to acquire property.*[35]

The efforts of Woodward and his followers to demonstrate the universal applicability of manual training--their insistence on its value in disciplining the faculties, building character, and creating unity--were a part of a conscious attempt to identify their program with the traditional aims of common schooling. Manual training, they claimed, taught only what was generally useful. It inculcated essential values, disciplined essential faculties, and taught essential skills. In making such claims, the reformers were not being devious. They had, in fact, attempted to preserve important elements of traditional schooling.

They avoided differential training and maintained a prescribed curriculum in order that the children of the rich and the poor would labor side-by-side in the manual training school. They refused to eliminate "cultural" subjects from the high school, and, perhaps most important, they never suggested that manual training should replace or even limit the moral education of the early elementary years.

The extraordinary caution of manual training advocates betrayed a suspicion that extensive industrial education might in practice undermine the school's ability to unify. Because they assumed that cohesion required a deliberately-cultivated common culture and morality, the reformers resisted a thorough refashioning of the school. Instead, they sought to add manual training to an already existing curricular structure and gave little thought to a redefinition of the relationship of the school to the society. Responding to demands they perceived as contradictory, they vacillated between a training that would meet the special needs of potential mechanics and one that would have general value. Unable to envision a scheme that could at once prepare children for specific vocations and promote social harmony, the reformers simply attempted to balance conflicting needs they could never integrate.

The effort of these reformers to adapt and preserve in such careful balance was symptomatic of a crisis of values that affected social theorists and institutional leaders in all areas of American life in the late nineteenth century. At the core of the crisis lay a profound uneasiness about the social differentiation required by an emerging industrial order. Rigid social stratification was hardly new to American society, but pre-Civil War theorists had never conceived of it as inherent in the order of things. Because wealth was abundant and only rudimentary skills were needed to acquire it, Jacksonian spokesmen always assumed the possibility of a mobile, egalitarian society where the gap between classes would be narrowed and tensions greatly reduced. As production became more specialized, however, that possibility appeared increasingly remote. A new differentiation, based on economic function and essential to the industrial enterprise itself, threatened to create new and more permanent divisions. Late nineteenth-century theorists saw clearly the possibilities of division but perceived only vaguely the potential integrating effects of a smoothly operating industrialism. Unlike their twentieth-century successors, they were unable to envision a cohesion that arose from the workings of the new order itself. Obsessed by the prospect off disorder, they clung to the hope of a unifying morality that would work against what they viewed as the inherent disintegrating effects of industrialism. This faith in a deliberately-cultivated morality as a way to guarantee social unity was precisely the quality of late nineteenth-century thought that educational reformers embodied so well. In their efforts to teach only general skills and preserve moral and cultural education, the reformers were simply reflecting the deepest concern of an age profoundly disturbed by the problem of social cohesion.

NOTES

1. M. A. Newell, presidential address, *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association, Session of the Year 1877, at Louisville, Ky.* (Salem, Ohio, 1877), p. 13.

2. Emerson E. White, "Technical Training in American Schools," *NEA Proceedings, 1880*, p. 222.

3. J. L. Pickard, "City Systems of Management of Public Schools," *NEA Proceedings, 1883*, p. 69.

4. White, "Technical Training in American Schools," p. 222.

5. A. D. Mayo, "The Demands of the Coming Century on the American Common School," *NEA Proceedings, 1876*, p. 24.

6. J. E. Seaman, "High Schools and the State," *NEA Proceedings, 1885*, p. 175.

7. John D. Runkle, "The Manual Element in Education," in *Forty-first Annual Report of the Massachusetts Board of Education, 1876-77*(Boston, 1878), p. 188; Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York, 1961), pp. 24-25.

8. Runkle, "The Manual Element in Education," p. 192.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 191-192.

10. *Ibid.*, pp. 188, 216.

11. Charles P. Coates, *History of the Manual Training School of Washington University*, U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, No. 3 (Washington, 1923), pp. 14-17.

12. *Ibid.* Charles A. Bennett, *History of Manual and Industrial Education, 1870-1917* (Peoria, Ill., 1937), p. 353; Calvin M. Woodward, "The Function of an American Manual Training School," *NEA Proceedings, 1882*, p. 151; Calvin M. Woodward, "The Results of the St. Louis Manual Training Movement," *NEA Proceedings, 1889*, p. 73.

13. See Issac Edward Clarke, *Art and Industry: American Education in the Industrial and Fine Arts*, II (Washington, 1892), 774.

14. *Ibid.*, II, 112-113; U.S. Bureau of Education, *Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1893-1894*, II, 2099.

15. John M. Ordway, "Handwork in the Schools," *NEA Proceedings, 1881*, p. 319. See also Thomas Hampson, "The Apprenticeship Question and Industrial Schools," *NEA Proceedings, 1885*, p. 151.

16. Augustus Jacobson, "A Layman's View of Manual Training," *NEA Proceedings, 1881*, p. 229.

17. Woodward, "The Function of an American Manual Training School," p. 151.

18. Jacobson, "A Layman's View of Manual Training," p. 227.

19. Louis B. Soldan, "The Century and the School," *NEA Proceedings, 1881*, p. 151.

20. Calvin M. Woodward, "Manual Training," *NEA Proceedings, 1883*, p. 87.

21. Woodward, "The Function of an American Manual Training School," p. 151.

22. Woodward, "The Results of the St. Louis Manual Training School," p. 77.

23. Clarke, *Art and Industry*, I, cxxxvi.

24. Calvin M. Woodward, *Manual Training in Education* (London, 1898), p. 44.

25. Calvin M. Woodward, *The Manual Training School* (Boston: 1877), p. 301.

26. Nicholas Murray Butler, "Manual Training," *NEA Proceedings, 1888*, p. 272.

27. Ordway, "Handwork in the School," p. 331.

28. Woodward, *The Manual Training School*, p. 319.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 312.

30. John E. Bradley, "The Influence of Manual Training on Habits of Thought," NEA *Proceedings, 1892*, pp. 665-667.

31. John E. Bradley, "Manual Training in Grammar Grades," NEA *Proceedings, 1890*, p. 836.

32. Woodward, "Manual Training," p. 93.

33. Bradley, "The Influence of Manual Training on Habits of Thought," p. 669.

34. Woodward, *Manual Training in Education*, p. 128.

35. Jacobson, "A Layman's View of Manual Training, p. 302.

CANADIAN EDUCATION
An
Editor's Supplement

It is proper that the first issue of our new journal include papers on Canadian Education. Historians of education in the midwestern United States have had a continuing interest in our sister democracy because of our shared geographical proximity and historical past. No one man better exemplifies this common bond and scholarly concern than Dr. Carl Gross of Michigan State University. He foresaw the importance of the study of Canadian Education, and made it the focus of his doctoral thesis. As our mentor, he made this interest live for us in the classroom.

Hence, it is appropriate, and fortunate that we are able to capitalize on some of the excellent papers that were presented at previous meetings of our society and publish them under the theme of Canadian Education. Dr. Gross's paper is on an important pioneer Canadian educator, Bishop John Strachan. Dr. Keith Wilson deals with the historical development of a cultural problem of Canadian Education, multilingualism and the subject of Dr. Robert Patterson's paper is the influence of American progressive educational thought on Canadian Education. Dr. Wilson and Dr. Patterson are former graduate students of Dr. Gross. The editor, also one of Dr. Gross's former students would like to dedicate this supplement of the journal to him, for his abiding interest in the subject, his strong support of our society, and from all of us who proudly say he was our teacher.

Edward Rutkowski
Editor

JOHN STRACHAN, A CONTROVERSIAL FIGURE

by

Dr. Carl H. Gross
Professor of Education
Michigan State University

Introduction

In the centennial year of 1967 the attention of the world had been direct to Canada. The British North America Act, which laid the basis for Canadian Federation one-hundred years ago, is also the act which has determined the development of education in Canada through its section 93. 1967 then is a significant anniversary in the educational history of Canada. 1867 was also the year that one of its famous educators died. All Saints Day (November 1, 1867) marked the end of the long life of John Strachan, first bishop of Toronto, a leading educator and statesman.

In 1870 the chancel of St. James Cathedral was beautified to honor the memory of John Strachan. The life-like bust in white marble in the cathedral wrought by Forsyth of Montreal has the following inscription under it:

"Near this spot rest the mortal remains of John Strachan, First Bishop of Toronto, who departed this life November the 1st, 1867, in the ninetieth year of his age and the twenty-ninth year of his episcopate. His conspicuous labours, foresight, and contancy in the service of the church and commonwealth, as an educator, as a minister of religion, as a statesman, form an important portion of the early history of Western Canada. During thirty-five years he was rector of this church and parish. In remembrance of him, the congregation have beautified the chancel and erected this memorial.

Easter, 1870."

This epitaph succinctly summarizes the achievements of John Strachan, but it does little to alert the visitor who reads this inscription to the controversial nature of the first bishop of Toronto. The apologists of this eminent churchman and educator present a very complimentary picture of him. This is particularly true in the MEMOIR OF THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN STRACHAN, written by his Coadjustor, successor, and friend in 1870, Bishop A. N. Bethune. Less flattering are Sir John Colborne's remarks, who became lieutenant governor of Upper Canada in 1828. He described Strachan in the following words: "I cannot blind myself so far as not to be convinced that the political part he has taken in Upper Canada destroys his clerical influence, and injures to a very great degree the interests of the episcopal church, and, I am afraid, of religion also."[1] Even more bitter was Robert Gourley's indictment of Strachan, when he called him ""a lying little fool of a renegade Presbyterian.""[2]

Wallace sums up his reactions by stating "He (Strachan) was a man of whom it is difficult to form a fair opinion: he had, in his own way, high ideals, but he had also a good idea of feathering his own nest, and his influence on the course of public affairs in Upper Canada was almost uniformly pernicious."[3] The determination of Strachan shows up repeatedly. Although there are many instances in his life where his position did not prevail, perhaps he won too often. Thomas Carlyle met Strachan in 1824 at Edward Irving's house. The defeat administered Carlyle in the discussion that day was not forgotten. Forty-three years later Carlyle remembered the instance in his REMINISCENCES: ""There were other disastrous or unpleasant figures whom I met at Irving's: a Danish fanatic of Calvinistic species (frequently, and had to keep him off), a good many fanatics of different kinds--one insolent "Bishop of Toronto", triumphant Canadian but Aberdeen by dialect (once only, from whom Irving defended me.)""[4]

Egerton Ryerson, often considered the foremost of Canadian educators, had crossed swords with Strachan. However, Ryerson felt that Strachan was honest in his statements and opinions. He also felt that Strachan became more liberal and moderate in his later years. Later the two famous educators became personal friends. Dr. Ryerson paid the following tribute in his November, 1867, issue of his JOURNAL OF EDUCATION: "Among several remarkable men who have, full of years and honours, passed from us during the last decade, none has distinguished himself more than the Honourable and Right Reverend John Strachan, D.D., LL.D., later Bishop of Toronto: a man remarkable for energy, courage, concentration of purpose, tact, and perseverance in whatever he undertook,--a man remarkable for his success in life, for the faithfulness and ability with which he fulfilled the duties of every office to which he was successively called, whether as Parish School Master, in Scotland, Grammar School Master in Canada, Parish Clergyman, Member of an Executive and a Legislative Council, President of a College, or Bishop of the largest Diocese in British North America--a man as thoroughly Canadian as any native of the country, remarkable for the genial qualities of private friendship, for acute discernment, disinterested and sound judgment as a Counsellor, for self-sacrifice, devotion and tenderness as a visitor of the sick and afflicted--a man without brilliancy of talents or attractions of oratory, but on all occasions occupying the first position in the spontaneous homage of those around him, by his strong sense, his vigorous understanding, his downright honesty, his resolute firmness, his unflagging industry--a man unrelaxing in his labours and unfailing in his faculties during a ministry of sixty-four years and down to the ninetieth year of his age--a man who had long outlived jealousy of distinctions and the enmity of parties, and who ceased 'at once to work and live', amid the respect and regrets of all classes of the population."[5]

Life

In order to understand and evaluate John Strachan a review of his life is necessary. The mystic may find some significance in the fact that he was "born at the twelfth hour of the twelfth day of the month; that the day had been Sunday; that the Sacrament had been dispensing; and that the tide had been at flood."[6] The historian would merely state that he was born at Aberdeen, Scotland, on April 12, 1778. That he was born into a religious atmosphere can be attested by the religious upbringing given him by his mother. This situation was also a basis of controversy later in his life when some of his critics hailed him as a renegade Presbyterian, who felt he took Holy Orders in the Church of England merely for monetary advantages.

Although technically a member of the Presbyterian church, Strachan's mother was also a dissenter of the Church of Scotland, joining the Relief Church or the Scottish Methodists. Today we might well find her active in the ecumenical movement, as she held communion with all who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ--even with the Episcopalians. Strachan's father, a quarry man, belonged to the Nonjurant Episcopalian Church, a group who would not swear allegiance to the House of Hanover because of their allegiance to the Stuarts. Thus, the later insinuations raised against Strachan concerning his early religious background must be judged in the light of the divided nature of his home.

John Strachan's father died at the age of 52, when the son himself was only 16 years of age. Being devoted to his mother, he was troubled by the need of giving her financial help and obtaining an education. He was fortunate enough to be able to attend the University of Aberdeen on bursaries.

Strachan's interest in education was whetted by his experiences in teaching school near St. Andrews and in the parish school of Kettle during vacation periods. He had been given consideration for an assistantship at the University of Glasgow, which would have led to an appointment to a chair at the University. Since this opportunity did not materialize and since he needed money he accepted a position at Kingston, Ontario. He had been enticed to come to Canada by Lord Simcoe who had visions of establishing a college. Arriving in Canada near the end of 1799, Strachan found that the projected Academy was only a fancy. Like many another person in a similar situation he stated that he would have returned to England had he had the money.

The experiences he had in teaching in Scotland were not lost and the opportunities in Canada led to successes so that the last 67 years of his life were spent in his adopted country, where he made a mark in church, in state, and in education. These activities are so intertwined that the threads cannot be separated if the reader wants to understand his motives and his actions.

While at Kingston Strachan started a school. At the same time he devoted himself to the study of theology. Bishop Mountain of Quebec most probably confirmed him in 1800 on his Second Visitation. In 1803 he presented himself for ordination as a deacon, and a year later he was ordained a priest by the Bishop of Quebec.

Following his ordination, he was appointed clergyman in Cornwall in 1803. Lieutenant-Governor Hunter is credited with this appointment. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel also adopted him as its missionary. Again the insinuation has been interjected that the better salary at Cornwall influenced Strachan in leaving Kingston, although the total was a mere £100 a year.

The grammar school which Strachan opened at Cornwall became famous. He adapted the methods of the parish schools of Scotland. The *Upper Canada Gazette* of August 24, 1805, reported favorably on the public examination of the pupils of Strachan's school. The examination was rigid and the students acquitted themselves with great credit in the Latin classics, bookkeeping, elements of mathematics, elements of geography, of natural and civil history. We may well question some of Strachan's pedagogical methods, such as competition, emulation, rivalry, and embarrassment. One form of punishment meted out by the teacher was memorization.

While at Cornwall the LL.D. degree was conferred upon him by the University of St. Andrews (1807) and the D.D. by the University of Aberdeen (1811). Though interested in teaching, the way to advancement came through the Church. In 1812 he was offered the church and school at York by Major General Brock. This offer he declined. When, however, the chaplaincy of the Legislative Council and the chaplaincy of the troops was presented as an added inducement, he accepted. Thus, in 1813 he became rector of York, and the rest of his life was spent in what is now Toronto.

It was in York that the Reverend Strachan reached the height of his career in church, state, and education. After fourteen years of residence in York, two new archdeaconries for Upper Canada became official, and Strachan was appointed Archdeacon of York. Twelve years later (1839) he was consecrated the first bishop of Toronto. This event took place in London with the Archbishop of Canterbury officiating. The work of the bishopric became more taxing, so that in 1846 Strachan resigned as rector of Toronto and archdeacon of York, and concentrated his ecclesiastical activities upon the work of bishop. He governed this most powerful see in Upper Canada in an energetic and dominant manner. He established the first Diocesan Synod in Canada. An interesting account is given of his manner of handling his clerics. "'Sit down, man, you are talking havers,' was the measure meted out to one who was wandering from the point and wasting the time of the Synod. 'But, my Lord, I protest.'– 'Sit down, man,' commanded the Bishop again. 'But, my Lord, I am in the hands of the Synod.' 'Nonsense, man,' came the final reply, 'You are not in the hands of the Synod, you are in my hands, I tell you, sit down.'"[7] Despite this rather autocratic picture of the bishop, there are many other stories which indicate the interest he took in the personal matters of his clergy, assisting them when in need, both in counsel and material help. Interested as he was in education and politics, he was first and last a churchman, and can only be understood with this in mind. During the evening of his life, the concerns of the church were the interests which remained.

Thirteen days before his death, he attended the Cathedral for the last time. Seeming to have a premonition of his death, he bade good-bye to all who attended church. Shaking hands with each of them, he prayed God that He would bless each of them. On the evening of October 31, he received the Holy Communion from his friend, the rector of his parish. The next day, All Saints Day, the end came. Bishop A. N. Bethune describes his strong faith and the basic purpose of his mission in life by the following words of his death: "he breathed his last,--his spirit flown to the company of those who had toiled through life for the same adorable Master,--another in the throng of that great 'cloud of witnesses', who are waiting their reward on the Judgment Day."[18]

John Strachan early became a political leader in the colony. Soon after his arrival in York, he criticized the United States for its involvement in the War of 1812 in a sermon. Then when the city was besieged by the Americans under General Dearborn, Strachan tried to protect property from plunder. In an altercation with an American soldier he nearly lost his life. Strachan was appointed to the Executive Council of the province of Upper Canada, and served in that capacity from 1818 to 1836. In 1820 he was appointed to the Legislative Council, and served in that role until 1841. This was the period of the political control of the Family Compact. Although the term hardly fits Canada, yet historians use it repeatedly. It certainly did not apply in Strachan's case, as he had no family relationships until his son married the daughter of John Beverley Robinson in 1844. Generally, the Family Compact held to a conservative position and fought off the reformers promoting democracy. Judging from the standards of the Twentieth Century it is difficult to justify the attitudes of men like Peregrine Maitland, William Dummer Powell, John Beverley Robinson, and John Strachan. That he may have hurt the cause of religion through these activities has already been mentioned.

It was in the political arena that Strachan fought his battles for the maintenance of the Clergy Reserves and the establishment of the university. The hustings cry in the election of 1828 in Upper Canada was centered on these two issues. Strachan's cause lost as the candidates supporting him were defeated. Defeated ultimately on both the clergy reserves issue and his attempt to prevent the secularization of the University of York, he, nevertheless, was a powerful political figure. In fact, opposition which contributed to his downfall resulted from the feeling that he exercised too much influence over the lieutenant governor. Scadding feels that Strachan stood next to John Graves Simcoe in his influence upon Upper Canada.[9] Fortunately, he withdrew from active participation in politics, and the criticism leveled against Strachan in 1828 by the able lieutenant governor Sir John Colborne was gradually forgotten.

Since this paper is chiefly interested in educational contributions of John Strachan, his activities in that field after his arrival in York (Toronto) will now be considered. Continuing his interest in teaching in his new assignment in York, Strachan was Head Master of the old Blue School, afterwards known as the Home District Grammar School, from 1812 to 1823. In 1807 an act was passed establishing a grammar school in each district in the province. Strachan had been highly responsible for this act. This school was the first established under the act, and had been saved from flames when Americans occupied York in April, 1813. Under Strachan's scheme of higher education under ecclesiastic supervision, this school was later merged into Upper Canada College in 1829.

His increasing religious and political activities precluded further teaching in school. However, the list of students attending classes under Strachan at Kingston, Cornwall, and York reads like a Who's Who of Canada. Of the 30 barristers in Upper Canada, 11 had been Strachan's scholars. Included in this list were the Attorney and Soliciter General. One-seventh of the members of the House of Assembly and one-fifth of the clergy of Upper Canada had been his students. Even Lower Canada felt his influence as three of the few English lawyers had studied under him. Students at the Cornwall secondary school alone included three chief justices, one chancellor, and two premiers of the province of Ontario.

The respect of the students is shown in the letter written to Doctor Strachan at the close of examinations in 1807, while he was at Cornwall. The letter stated:

"Should this, our general wish, meet his approbation, we pledge ourselves to keep in mind those correct habits which he has endeavored to render familiar to us, and ever to cherish those pure principles of virtue and religion, which we have been taught. And, should our success in life be equal to what our education may lead us to expect, we shall most willingly exert our influence in disseminating useful knowledge; nor shall our gratitude fail in supporting, as far as we are able, the just claims of the Academy over which our Tutor presides."[10] This was signed by John E. Robinson, who later became chief justice of the province.

Since he had originally come to Canada to establish an academy, which hopefully was to become a university, he always had an interest in higher education. He was the spokesman and advocate for King's College and obtained the Royal charter for the same. His famous APPEAL TO THE FRIENDS OF RELIGION AND LITERATURE ON BEHALF OF THE UNIVERSITY OF UPPER CANADA presented his concerns about the lack of higher education in Canada. He felt that the district schools had been established to become nurseries for the university. Unfortunately, there was not a seminary in either Upper or Lower Canada above the rank of a good school. He especially decried the fact that Englishmen had no opportunity in Canada to obtain instruction in law, medicine, or divinity. Since the expense of going to Great Britain was prohibitive and the distance so great that students had to be removed from their families for too great a time, Canadians were obtaining their education in the United States. Never having been fond of the United States, he was concerned of the effects of the southern neighbor upon the students. He did admit that education in the United States was superior to anything in Upper Canada, but felt it inferior to education in Great Britain. His reactions are of interest: "Now in the United States a custom prevails unknown to or unpracticed by any other nation; in all other countries morals and religion are made the basis for public instruction, and the first books put into the hand of children teach them the domestic, the social, and religious virtues; but in the United States politics pervade the whole system of education; the school books from the very first elements are stuffed with praises of their own institutions and breathe hatred to everything English.

To such a country our youth may go strongly attached to their native land and to all its establishments, but by hearing them continually depreciated and those of America praised, this attachment will in many be gradually weakened; and some may become fascinated with that liberty which has degenerated into licentiousness, and imbibe, perhaps unconsciously, sentiments unfriendly to things of which Englishmen are proud."[11]

He cited as convincing statistics that three-fourths of the doctors of the province had been educated in the United States. Clergymen were educated in England or by their elder brethren within the province. He felt those educated in the province had an advantage over those from England as they were better acquainted with the people they were to serve. Of the ministers of other denominations except for the Church of Scotland, they came from the republican states of America.

In 1827 a Royal Charter by Letters Patent, under the General Seal, was granted which established King's College. King's College was delayed in opening due to the low standard of secondary education. Its cornerstone was finally laid in 1842. The university was publicly opened on June 8, 1843, with 27 students in attendance. From the time of the granting of the charter until 1848, Strachan served as president of King's College.

Since Strachan felt that religion was the cornerstone of education, a strong Anglican influence was found in King's College even though "No religious test was to be applied to any of its students, excepting only to graduates in divinity, who were to be subject to the conditions enjoined for divinity degrees at

Oxford. The seven professors in Arts were to be members of the Church of England, and the Bishop of the Dioceses for the time being was to be Visitor. The President was to be a clergyman in Holt Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, and the Archdeacon of York, for the time being, was to be at all times President of the College."[12]

Critical attacks were levied against King's College by the Reformers, who agitated for a secular institution. Strachan opposed them, trying to keep the institution religious but supported by royal grant. Interestingly he opposed other denominations who desire colleges in the university. In 1848 the Reformers came into power and changed the university to the University of Toronto. Disheartened Strachan separated his relations with the new University, as he still opposed a secular institution of higher learning.

Still convinced of his position he immediately took steps to establish a new college. Not only in Canada, but also in England, he waged his campaign for the establishment of Trinty College. Here again he was successful, and in 1852 a Royal Charter was granted establishing the University of Trinity College. He became its first chancellor. Since he felt that the secularization of King's College made it godless and since education without religion was untenable, Trinity College was to be a true university preparing students to enter the legal and medical professions as well as the ministry. This is succintly expressed in the following words by Strachan stated at the stone-laying: "'I lay this cornerstone of an edifice to be here erected by the name of Trinity College, to be a place of sound learning and religious education in accordance with the principles and usages of the United Church of England and Ireland. Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, even Jesus Christ, who is God over all, blessed forevermore; and in whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins.'"[13]

In January, 1852, Strachan included the following in his address at the inauguration of Trinity College: "'When we speak of education based on religion, we mean by religion the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that instruction on this, the most important of all knowledge, shall not be confined to public worship, but shall enter largely into the studies and training of every department of the College.'"[14]

In the field of higher education during the first half of the nineteenth century, John Strachan was Canada's most vigorous supporter. The University of Toronto and Trinty College, now federated with it, are living tributes to his work. His imprint on Ontario through the students who attended his grammar schools was impressive. Although basically a clergyman, his contributions to education and politics warranted the eulogies that were presented at his death. The memorial sermons justifiedly took note of these.

Controversial Aspects of the Man

A man often becomes controversial due to his beliefs, while another due to his actions. Bishop Strachan had the unhappy facility to become controversial due to both. His biographer states: "The late Bishop was a man without prejudice, and wholly free from party spirit."[15] Others did not completely share this view. J. M. S. Careless states: "Archdeacon Strachan, however, the leader of the Church of England in the colony and member of the Compact; insisted on Anglican dominance, and sought to extend it also over education."[16]

The major area of controversy centered around the linkage between religion and education in philosophy and the tie between religion and politics in action. Since Strachan was actively engaged in all three areas it was natural that neither he nor his critics would compartmentalize his thoughts or his actions. Although Canada had close ties with England, nevertheless the multiplicity of religious groups and the secularism of the New World did not form a favorable environment for an established church based on the prototype of the Old World. Thus, when Strachan believed thoroughly in the Established Church of

114

England having special privileges in Canada, he provoked opposition. This became especially apparent in the controversy concerning the Clergy Reserves and the secularization of King's College. Added to this was the entire question of the role of religion in education. Finally, it was not the question whether the Anglican Church should have control of King's College, but whether this institution should give any place to religion.

In the field of action Bishop Strachan again used all his political power to further the cause of the Church of England. His influence as a member of the so-called Family Compact was tremendous. His opponents felt that he represented the establishment and was opposed to more democratic government. As member of the Executive Council when the Reformers were trying to gain more power, his dual role of religious and political leader was a strong irritant.

Strachan's narrow view in religion came to the front in the long and bitter conflict regarding the Clergy Preserves. The clerical preserves of Upper Canada established in 1791 for a "Protestant clergy" were being limited to the Church of England. Since the clergy preserves and crown preserves were untaxable and amounted to two-sevenths of the land of Upper Canada, they were a source of irritation. They also interfered with settlement and the development of roads. Thus, may different groups desired to see the clergy reserves opened up to the public. Even the religious groups would not support their maintenance when only one denomination was benefiting from them.

Strachan claimed that the Church of England was the established church in Upper Canada and deserved more liberal support from the home government. In order to win his argument he blackened the good name of other religious bodies in Upper Canada. In order to justify the position that the clergy reserves were the domain of the Church of England, the argument was presented that when the act was established, during the reign of George III, Protestant clergy referred only to the clergy of the Church of England. Lawyer John Patteson supported this position when the case was argued in England in 1824. The members of the governing clique of Upper Canada from the time of the established government belonged to the Church of England. Actually this was the aristocratic minority in the province. The Methodist and the Presbyterian Church of Scotland were especially popular from an early date.

As the debates raged on the clergy reserves, Strachan vigorously supported the status quo. The opposition made this an election issue in 1828. The opposition won the election. The Assembly then passed a resolution that the clergy reserves should be withdrawn and appropriated to the "purposes of ordinary education and general improvement." The Courts of Law did not uphold this act. In 1840 the Governor General proposed a settlement for the Clergy Reserves. Strachan again opposed the plan of settlement. The House of Assembly passed the plan 28 to 20 and the Legislative Council gave its support by a vote of 13 to 5, Strachan notwithstanding. Strachan then called upon friends in England to press the issue in the House of Lords and to the courts, but they ruled that the Protestant clergy included the Church of Scotland as well as the Church of England. There is no need to trace the conflict to its bitter end, which resulted in the defeat of Strachan's position, and the secularization of the Clergy Reserves for the final time in 1854.

The other chief area of controversy centered in King's College. There is no doubt that Strachan was an apostle for higher education and deserves credit for the establishment of King's College. Unfortunately, he could not reconcile his views with changing times and the recognition that the majority of the people didn't want this institution controlled by the Church of England. He felt that the conditions for the establishment of the College, as mentioned previously, were liberal as no religious test was to be applied to the students. He even prompted the King's College Council in 1837 to modify the Charter so that the objectionable features of denominational exclusiveness would be removed. Wisely they did so, and the modified charter passed both houses of the legislature in 1837.

There were continued attacks upon King's College. Most of these came from the Reformers, who desired a secular institution. Although Strachan had made some concessions, they were not enough. He opposed the Reformers, and tried to keep King's College religious and at the same time supported by a royal grant. He also opposed other denominations having colleges in the university. The basic issue really was whether education without religion could be worthy of its name. When the Reformers wanted to change the charter, Strachan argued that the annuling of the endowment could set a precedent for the revocation of any charter, and all private and public property would be at the mercy of the legislative body.

When the Reformers came into power in 1848 and changed the University of York to the University of Toronto, this ended Strachan's leadership of King's College. This, of course, was a bitter blow to him. Undaunted, he proposed the establishment of a new university which would be controlled by the Church of England. He spent vast energies in its behalf. He begged for the support of his clergy and laity and worked vigorously in its behalf in his diocese. Although 72 years of age, he made a trip to England trying to gain recognition and financial support for the same. While in England he tried to have Parliament suspend the act establishing the University of Toronto. He never seemed to know when he was beaten. Although unsuccessful in this he did arouse interest in Trinity College, gained financial support, and eventually obtained a Royal Charter for the same.

As head of the Church of England in Upper Canada, member of the Executive Council, and involved in the controversies just mentioned, his personal life and motives became controversial. Anne Peck calls him a "Tory of Tories".[17] He generally had decided views. His opponents therefore looked for personal weaknesses.

Having been born in Scotland, educated in a Scottish university, studying theology there, but never taking holy orders in the Church of Scotland, some nevertheless felt him a traitor to his church. In fact, Johnstone interpreted Strachan's action in joining the Church of England when he came to Canada as part of his opportunism. "The position of the Church of England in Canada at this time, while not that of a church established by law, was in his estimation preferable to that of any other religious body, and so Strachan joined it, and was ordained in 1803."[18]

It is true that he was amibitous, and had desired to be appointed bishop 20 years before he actually was. As early as 1816 he hinted to Colonel Clifford that he hoped to be Prime Minister of the Province some day. That he wanted to be bishop is established. That he wished to be prime minister is also possible. Thus, here again his ambitions could easily have made him the focal point of controversy.

The fact that he repeatedly was influenced by pecuniary advancements made him the subject of criticism. Even his biographer notes that he married a physician's daughter in Cornwall, who was a widow with a handsome annuity. Young relates the incident with more embellishment. "Another story which emphasized Strachan's alleged cupidity has recently appeared in print. Being engaged, it is said to a Miss Wood of Cornwall, he was not making haste to be married. One day the lady went to him and said: 'John, dear, Mr. McGill (who is described as very rich and very old, albeit he was only forty-six years of age) wants me to marry him.' 'Well, my dear,' the young deacon is said to have replied, 'You had better take him, I'll wait.' In two years' time she was a widow with a life annuity of $1200; and in two years she became Mrs. Strachan"[19]

Understanding the Man

A lengthy character study of John Strachan could merely lead into the hypothetical. His affiliation with the Church of England can be explained. Ambitious he most probably was. Whether this is a virtue or a vice is debatable. The general stereotype that a clergyman is not, or rather should not, be motivated by money is also a fruitless study.

Caveo send non Timeo (Prudent but fearless) was his personal motto. He was a tough fighter, a committed Anglican, convinced that his views were right, an ardent Tory, anxious to promote education. To truly understand Bishop Strachan, it is important to ascertain why he took the stand that he did on the Clergy Reserves and King's College issues. Even his position on these issues and the lengths he went to in supporting them can be explained by his attitude toward religion, state, and education.

Johnstone gives us a clue, when he states: "John Strachan, in spite of his early Presbyterian training (or, was it because of it?), was a stern, uncompromising churchman. He believed in the union of Church and State, and considered that all education, from the primary school to the university, should be in close connection with the church of the nation."[20]

A. N. Bethune cites enough evidence to support the position that the Bishop was a committed Christian whose highest work was to serve his Savior. Bethune describes his face in death with the following words: "but like one who had yielded up his last breath in cheerful contentment that his work was done, and that he was called upon to face a Master whom he had tried faithfully to serve, but on whose mercy and merits alone he after all relied."[21] Recognizing that history portrays some unsavory characters who have carried on their villianry under the guise of religion, this explanation alone might not suffice. But villain he was not. Nor was he a hypocrite. Strachan as a churchman saw his commission clearly, fitting into a world which accepted the absolutes of Scripture and dogma more readily than today. Although he warred against other religious denominations and especially against the Roman Church, he felt that the Church of England was truly catholic. Yet in his primary charge to the clergy in 1841, he is a resolute defender of the faith and particularly of his church. "She, the Church of England, gives countenance to no loose fancies, whether termed Evangelical or Catholic, but adheres to the Bible, and insists only upon such doctrines as may be proved to be historical facts, derived from the apostles and retained in the Church from the first. Such is the acknowledged basis on which the Church of England established her principles and proves herself catholic and apostolic."22

Thus, as God's servant and prelate in God's church, namely, the Church of England, Bishop Strachan felt obliged to advance God's work in every way possible. He used his influence in the political arena in behalf of his church, because he felt that his church needed every type of political support possible and because it was God's agency on earth to win souls for eternity and promote a sound temporal society.

This led him to espouse religious education. Separation of religion and education was inconceivable to him. This became very evident after the University of Toronto was established. He lauded its success in giving youth intellectual culture, but felt that without religious character it would never have the moral weight and influence of the great universities of England. In his pastoral letter 1851, he presents his attitude on this matter. "Let literature and science have free scope, but let them be carefully impregnated with those Christian principles which can alone impart true worth and stability to character."23 He felt the province had repudiated the principles of Christianity by the secularization of King's College. In his pastoral letter he felt that he had the support of the English people. "Great astonishment was manifested and indignation expressed, and all lamented, as a melancholy sign of the times, that such a measure as the destruction of a Royal Charter, could have found favour in any British Colony, or been allowed to pass by a Christian government. It was very gratifying to me that neither in the United States, nor in England, did I find a single churchman who did not condemn in the severest language every attempt to separate education from religion, as well as the oppressive treatment which the Church has received in this Colony."24

With this underlying philosophy one can readily understand why he wanted to hold the Clergy Reserves for the Church of England and why he felt that King's College had to have a religious emphasis. When this failed, we can also understand why a man advanced in years and overburdened with the responsibilities of his see, would exert all his energies to establish a new college, which would hopefully become a university, but which would be religiously oriented.

Beginning life as a teacher, continuing this in Canada, having won the respect and admiration of many pupils who gained outstanding success in their lives, we can only understand John Strachan and his actions by realizing his tremendous interest in education. He felt from the earliest that his teaching had to make some difference in the lives of his pupils. When he completed a lesson he conscientiously had a self-examination regarding the efficacy of his teaching. He believed in the practicality of education, which is shown in the Preface of his book entitled, A CONCISE INTRODUCTION TO PRACTICAL ARITHMETIC.[25] The story problems used to teach arithmetic were advanced for that period, as just one illustration indicates: "How old is a man born in the 1745, this present year?"[26]

His suggestions for education of grammar schools indicates his thorough knowledge of schools. The following recommendations are made by him in 1829:

1. Children should be studying at different levels in different classes.

2. Causes for misbehavior should be avoided or lessened. Corporal punishment could be generally laid aside.

3. Student government was proposed. School trials were set up with a jury system.

4. Bookkeeping was to be taught through a gamesmanship technique. One boy would serve as merchant, while his classmates were purchasers. In order to make the bookkeeping practical, a set of books was established for these transactions.

5. In civil history students prepared questions. These were given to students who stood above the questioner. If the student above could not answer the question, he changed places with the interrogator.[27]

Through Strachan's influence a law was passed in 1824 making a grant to each District for Common School education, appointing a Board in each District to examine and admit teachers, and to make an equitable distribution of funds within their bounds.

Perhaps his own review of his life best shows this interest in education. "'During twenty one years,' he wrote, 'I have conscientiously discharged my duty as a Parish Priest in Upper Canada--assisted in building almost all the Churches that have been erected in the Province, and for twenty-five years I have directed the moral and religious and scientific Education of all the principal youth--inspiring hundreds of them with pious and Loyal principles, by which they are attached most strongly to the Parent State. Almost all the young men of eminence in Upper Canada and many in Lower Canada have been my Pupils, and have for me this day the attachment of Children. I have promoted the establishment of Schools, drafted the bills for that purpose, and assisted in their enactment.'"[28]

Conclusion

John Strachan most probably will remain a controversial figure. Had he not had "feet of clay", had he not been a forceful individual, had he not been involved in three arenas of life, he might not have aroused the ire of as many people as he did. Despite his defects, his work as rector of St. James Cathedral, as the first Bishop of Toronto, for the establishment of the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto, the first of its kind in the British Empire, assures him of a lasting place in the annals of the history of the Church of England in Canada. As an educator he can only be fully appreciated by the record of his achievements through the laws he helped sponsor for the extension of education in Canada, the furtherance of higher education in Ontario, especially through King's College and Trinity College, whose influence upon English-speaking Canada has always been great. Thus, he is ranked next to Egerton Ryerson, as a Canadian educator.

NOTES

1. W. Steward Wallace, *The Family Compact*, Toronto, Brook and Company, 1915, p. 66.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

4. A. H. Young, "John Strachan," *Queens Quarterly*, Vol. XXXV, No. 4 (April, May, June, 1928) p. 397.

5. Cited in A. N. Bethune, *Memoir of the Right Reverend John Strachan*, Toronto, Henry Rowsell, 1870, pp. 339-340.

6. A. H. Young, p. 386.

7. A. H. Young, pp. 403-404.

8. A. N. Bethune, *Memoir of the Right Reverend John Strachan*, Toronto, Henry Rowsell, 1870, p. 296.

9. Henry Scadding, *Toronto of Old*, Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1966, p. 380.

10. J. George Hodgins, *The Establishment of Schools and Colleges in Ontario, 1792-1910*, Toronto, Printed and Published by L. K. Cameron, 1910, p. 200.

11. John Strachan, *An Appeal to the Friends of Religion and Literature on Behalf of the University of Upper Canada*, London, Printed by R. Gilbert, 1827, p. 5.

12. R. C. Johnstone, "John Strachan," in William B. Heeney (ed.), *Leaders of the Canadian Church*, Toronto, Musson Book Company, 1918, p. 84.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 87.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 87.

15. A. N. Bethune, p. 302.

16. J. M. S. Careless, *Canada*, New York, St. Martin's Press, 1964, p. 170.

17. Anne M. Peck, the *Pageant of Canadian History*, Toronto, Longmans, Green and Company, 1943, p. 200.

18. R. O. Johnstone, p. 82.

19. A. H. Young, p. 392.

20. R. C. Johnstone, p. 88.

21. A. N. Bethune, p. 297.

22. Right Rev. F. H. Wilkinson, *The Second John Strachan Memorial Address*, November 4, 1964, p. 4.

23. John Strachan, *Pastoral Letter from the Lord Bishop of Toronto*, Toronto, Printed by A. F. Plees, Printer to the Church University, 1851, p. 19.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 8.

25. John Strachan, *A Concise Introduction to Practical Arithmetic*, Montreal, Printed by Nahum Mower, 1809.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 33.

27. John Strachan, *A Letter, to the Rev. A. N. Bethune, Rector of Cobourg, on the Management of Grammar Schools*, York, Printed by R. Stanton, 1829.

28. A. H. Young, p. 395.

Bibliography

1. Bethune, A. N., *Memoir of the Right Reverend John Strachan*. Toronto, Henry Rowsell, 1870.

2. Careless, J. M. S., *Canada*. New York, St. Martin's Press, 1964.

3. Carrington, Philip, *The Anglican Church in Canada*. Toronto, Collins, 1963.

4. Guillet, Edwin C., *Early Life in Upper Canada*. Toronto, Ontario Publishing Company, Limited, 1933.

5. Hodgins, J. George, *The Establishment of Schools and Colleges in Ontario, 1792-1910*. Toronto, Printed and Published by L. K. Cameron, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1911.

6. Hodgins, J. George, *Historical and Other Papers and Documents Illustrative of the Educational System of Ontario, 1792-1853*. Toronto, Published by L. K. Cameron, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, 1911.

7. Johnstone, R. C., "John Strachan," in William B. Heeney (ed.), *Leaders of the Canadian Church*. Toronto, Musson Book Company, 1918.

8. Peck, Anne M., *The Pageant of Canadian History*. Toronto, Longmans, Green and Company, 1943.

9. Phillips, Charles E., *The Development of Education in Canada*., Toronto, W. J. Gage and Company, Limited, 1957.

10. Scadding, Henry, *Toronto of Old*. Toronto, Oxford University Press, 1966.

11. Strachan, John, *An Appeal to the Friends of Religion and*

Literature on Behalf of the University of Upper Canada, London, Printed by R. Gilbert, 1827.

12. Strachan, John, *A Charge, Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Toronto, at the Triennial Visitation*, Held in the Cathedral church of St. James, Toronto, on the 6th June, 1844, by the Hon. and Right Rev. John Strachan, D. D., Lord Bishop of Toronto, Cobourg, Printed at the Diocesan Press, 1844.

13. Strachan, John, *The Church of the Redeemed*: A Sermon, Preached on Wednesday, 5th October, 1836, at a meeting of the Clergy of the Established Church of Upper Canada, Toronto, Printed by Robert Stanton, 1836.

14. Strachan, John, *A Concise Introduction to Practical Arithmetic*, Montreal, Printed by Nahum Mower, 1809.

15. Strachan, John, *A Letter from the Lord Bishop of Toronto to the Rev. T. B. Murray, M.A. on the Subject of Establishing A Church University in Upper Canada*, London, Gilbert and Rivington, Printers, 1850.

16. Strachan, John, *A Letter, to the Rev. A. N. Bethune, Rector of Cobourg, on the Management of Grammar Schools*, York, Printed by R. Stanton, 1829. Letter was written on October 6, 1829.)

17. Strachan, John, *Pastoral Address, to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese of Toronto*, York, Upper Canada, March 9, 1852.

18. Strachan, John, *Pastoral Letter from the Lord Bishop of Toronto*, Toronto, Printed by A. F. Plees, Printer to the Church University, 1851.

19. Strachan, John, *A Speech, of the Venerable John Strachan, D.D., Archdeacon of York, in the Legislative Council,*

Thursday Sixth March, 1828: on the Subject of the Clergy Reserves, York, U.C., Printed by Robert Stanton, Published by Request, 1828.

20. Wallace, W. Stewart, *The Family Compact*, Toronto, Brook and Company, 1915.

21. Wilkinson, F. H., *The Second John Strachan Memorial Address*, (Delivered in the Cathedral Church of St. James on the 97th Anniversary of his death and the 125th Anniversary of the Founding of the Diocese, All Saints' Day, Sunday, November 1, 1964.

22. Young, A. H., "John Strachan", *Queens Quarterly*, Vol. XXXV, No. 4 (April, May, June, 1928) pp. 386-407.

AMERICAN INFLUENCE ON PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION IN CANADA

by

R. S. Patterson
Chairman, Department of
Educational Foundations
University of Alberta

In 1938 Peter Sandiford, a leading Canadian educator of the period, noted that Canadians were experiencing a nation-wide curricular reform based upon the ideas and practices associated with progressive education.[1] It was the first reform in education to have such a universal effect upon the various provincial systems of education. The revisions, based as they were upon a conception of education new to Canada, broke cleanly with the traditional belief that education was synonymous with the acquisition of useful knowlege. Instead, they stressed the development of character and citizenship and encouraged the provision of a stimulating environment in which student tendencies could be directed into "useful abilities and desirable attitudes."

Changes associated with this reform included the introduction of junior high schools or intermediate schools, wider recognition of and provision for individual differences, and increased emphasis upon shop work, art, household science, physical education, health and mental hygiene. The most significant aspect of the reform was the introduction of activity programmes. The principle of "learning by doing" permeated the schools of all provinces. According to Sandiford, this activity approach was "derived directly from the 'Progressive' element in American education"[2] Although enterprise, a word utilized in the English Hadow Report, was the term frequesntly employed in Canada to categorize the new approach, its origin and meaning was recognized as being similar to that of the more familiar American project. One of Sandiford's conclusions in his discussion of this reform was that the changes reflected "to an increasing extent the influence of American education on ours."[3]

At no time in the history of Canada has it been easy for Canadians to acknowledge a dependence on the United States. The 1930's were no exception. The difficulty in acknowledging the dependency did not, however, significantly affect the amount of borrowing which took place. Even though heavy borrowing was evident, the extension of progressive education into Canada was not accomplished without the arousal of a measure of suspicion and disfavor in Canada. The period of popularity of these ideas, coming as it did mainly after 1936, corresponded with a time in the United States when the movement was being seriously criticized. The educational leaders in Canada who encouraged the acceptance of these new ideas and practices were faced with the doubly difficult task of introducing an essentially American theory and pedagogy which was then held in some disrepute within the United States. As one critic of American influence on Canada noted "our whole educational system is dominated by methods taken over bodily and without examination from a country which is now abandoning them."[4] It is not surprising to find Canadian proponents of the new education claiming that the Canadian brand of progressive education was unique, a "home grown product"[5] that offered decided improvements over the American model and that captured the best of the traditional and the progressive systems. It would seem that the spirit of moderation which pervaded the Canadian approach to change operated to prevent the extreme forms of progressivism gaining a foothold in the schools. Sandiford in his description of the reform noted that the retention of examinations and the continued emphasis upon tool subjects were ways of providing "a brake for the too enthusiastic progressive."[6]

The advocates of progressive educational reform in Canada did not encourage an indiscriminate, wholesale adoption of the new education. Instead they encouraged and attempted the introduction of a selective reform. Few of the changes which were introduced or the practices growing out of these reforms were extreme. The deeply-rooted traditional values of schooling, the limitations imposed first by the economic hardship of the depression and later by the sacrifices associated with warfare made radical departures difficult. The teaching force was also a deterrent to extreme changes. The preparation of most teachers, generally limited to less than one year of training, still centered on pedagogical practices. Very few of the classroom teachers had any understanding of the underlying theory of progressive education. They were offered techniques and practices and very little of the fundamental thinking of people such as Dewey, Kilpatrick and Counts. It is not surprising that after reform had been undertaken in almost every province a leading curriculum authority was led to conclude:

> *Most American educators of the most progressive school regard Canadian education as most benighted, traditional and conservative. Canada has never followed the progressive movement in education, though the strengths of progressivism have made their contribution.*[7]

The nature and extent of the changes associated in Canada with progressive education are the subject of another paper. Suffice it here to recognize that the ideas and practices of progressive education were introduced into Canadian schools during the 1930's and early 1940's. The role played by the United States in this reform movement was significant in spite of the seemingly inherent Canadian aversion to American influence.

Canadian educators assumed the lead in the importation of progressive education into their country. Once the doors were opened and interest expanded, a continued reliance upon the American movement was necessary in order to sustain the interest and to explain and to support the reforms. Although there were capable educational leaders in Canada, they tended to rely upon the leaders of progressive education in the States to describe what was taking place in Canada. In the midst of this dependency Canadians seemed to naively assume that American influence was minimal. Their so-called "home-grown" products appeared to have a hidden stamp mark signifying that the product was "made in the United States."

A variety of conditions existed in Canada by the 1930's which facilitated the flow of educational ideas from the United States to Canada. Gradually, and some decades later than the United States, Canada had become a nation beset with the advantages and problems associated with an industrialized, urban population. Many of these problems come into focus following World War I when Canadians became aware that there was no longer an opportunity of returning to pre-War conditions for which they nostalgically longed. Instead they had to deal with a growing voice of discontent seeking reform and redress of grievances. Reform causes became popular. One of the stronger of these reform groups found its strength in the rural population of the country. Armed with ideas from their American counterparts these Canadian Progressives attacked what to them were the causes of their discontent and hardship. The commercial, industrial and financial interests, centered in eastern Canada, bore the brunt of Progressive scorn and attack. According to the Progressives, Canadian economic policy was inappropriately that of an urban society operating through the control of tariffs, railways and credit to capture the wealth of the rural areas. When only limited reform success was achieved through the established political parties, the Progressives moved outside the traditional party alignments and formed their own parties at both federal and provincial levels of government. Although federal success was limited and short-lived, provincial farmer governments were established in Ontario and Alberta, the latter one remaining in power from 1921 to 1935.

Dissatisfaction and unrest were apparent among other segments of the population. Women struggled for and gained recognition through suffrage. The labor element of the population was also uneasy. The high cost of living, low wages, and rising unemployment produced a disillusionment with the economic system. These conditions, not corrected prior to the cessation of international hostilities, were further aggravated by the return of soldiers. Radical action seemed to be the only alternative. Strikes increased in frequency. By the end of the 1920's Canadians were beginning to recognize that industrialism with its attendant benefits and ills was here to stay. Disparities between rural and urban life had become increasingly apparent and were major sources of unrest. The decade of the 1920's saw Canadians struggling to lessen the numerous sources of discontent.

In that the United States had experienced many of these problems decades before Canada and in that the two countries were in close proximity and growing more and more alike, the inclination of Canadians to draw upon American practice became stronger. The alienation between western and eastern Canada which accompanied the Progressive movement made it easier, especially for western Canada to turn to the United States for assistance.[8]

During the 1920's and 1930's Canadian education reflected a pattern similar to the one prevailing in the larger society. Just as pre-War provisions for women, laborers and farmers and for the social welfare of all Canadians were challenged following the War, so too post-War schooling was found wanting. The dissatisfaction and unrest of the 1920's which was associated with Canadian education can be regarded as the first step or phase of a series of steps which culminated in the sweeping reforms undertaken in Canadian education during the 1930's and early 1940's. The second step, one arising out of the unrest and accompanying the latter part of it, was a period of searching and exploration. Educators, aided by leaders of reform and government, looked for valid alternatives to contemporary school practice. The United States was only one, albeit the major one, of the many countries which offered alternatives to be considered for their possible place in Canadian schooling. The third phase of the reform movement began in the early 1930's and continued through the 1940's. It was characterized by the actual implementation of the reforms. The fourth phase could be described as the educational or popularization phase. Once the revisions had been made, it became readily apparent that there was a need to inform teachers, administrators and parents about the new approach. As the understanding of the new education grew, some provinces attempted further reforms which in effect extended the impact of progressive education in those provinces.

In each of the four stages associated with the reform American influence was apparent and prominent. Previous borrowing from the United States had been limited, but interest in the progressive education movement opened the doors to an extensive borrowing and dependency. Reliance by Canadians on United States experience and expertise had been growing in the twentieth century. So much so that one Canadian was led to critically remark:

> *All of our up-to-date information practically comes to us from the United States. We use the bulletin of the United States Bureau of Education to know what is going on in the western provinces even.*[9]

An examination of each of the four phases of the reform movement offers an understanding of the extent and the nature of American influence.

Much of the criticism arising following the War arose as a result of a new attitude toward education. The enrollment figures in elementary and secondary education reflected this changed outlook. Sheridan, writing in 1925, noted that enrollments in schools of the Prairies had increased remarkably and that a slight increase was evident in eastern Canada. According to the author, the school population of Manitoba between 1905 and 1920 doubled. For the corresponding period the school population in British Columbia tripled while in Alberta and Saskatchewan it increased five and seven fold. The largest increases were in secondary school attendance. In British Columbia and Saskatchewan in the same fifteen year period secondary school attendance increased seven and nine fold respectively.[10] These increases were a result of a combination of factors. The schools were becoming more attractive, especially as as result of more vocational programs, the economy, lagging as it was, discouraged early school withdrawal, democratic and equalitarian concepts were becoming increasingly prominent and compulsory education provisions were extended.[11]

Dissatisfaction with the educational provisions of the period was widespread. However, much of the controversy about education was centered on more adequate schooling for the rural school child. The agrarian political parties encouraged this concern and gave active leadership in education, as they did in the pursuit of better provisions for all facets of the rural life.

Generally, the demand for instruction, especially advanced instruction, outran the ability of the rural schools to provide it. The small school district, the typical unit of school administration, was recognized by professional educators as being the major barrier to better rural education. Debate over the relative merits of small and large units of school administration captured the majority of the interest centered on education during the period between 1920 and 1939. It was in the wake of this discussion that progressive education came into existence. The concern aroused over the desire for improved schooling provided the opportunity for educators to examine the new education.

In Alberta a committee was set up by the government under the United Farmers of Alberta to study rural education. The majority of their Report dealt with material related to the size of the school administrative unit and school finance. Included in this Report was the first formal mention that the Department of Education was looking to the theory and methods of progressive education as a partial solution to the ills of rural education.[12]

School surveys were the order of the day in the United States. Canadians followed the pattern in an attempt to find solutions to the ills apparent in the schools. The province to lead the way was Saskatchewan. H. W. Foght, Specialist in Rural School Practice in the United States Bureau of Education was invited to head a team of experts, predominantly Americans, in making a thorough study of the educational provisions of the province of Saskatchewan. The final report, made available in 1918,[13] drew extensively upon American practice and in the final recommendations encouraged the adoption of American models in dealing with rural school problems. Other provinces followed Saskatchewan's example and during the 1920's and early 1930's a series of surveys, commissions and studies were undertaken to diagnose and hopefully, cure the ills of education. One of the more forward looking of these studies was the Putman-Weir Survey in British Columbia. Although the leading figures in this investigation were Canadian, whereas their counterparts in other provinces were usually American, the dependence on American expertise and practice was nevertheless in the Report. Recommendations went beyond the large unit of administration to include encouragement of junior high schools, more attention to health and physical education, more activities of a less academic nature, and more depedence on recent research findings and curriculum reform.[14]

Not only were American practitioners and practice important in diagnosing ills of Canadian education but they provided the basis for many of the solutions which Canadians discussed and with which they experimented.

A variety of avenues were open for the flow of ideas from the United States to Canada. The professional literature published for teachers in Canada drew heavily from American publications and authors for material. The material drawn from non-Canadian sources prior to 1930 was seldom concerned with progressive education. As the new method and curriculum grew in popularity and, as some provinces attempted revisions along these lines, the number of articles dealing with the new education increased as did the dependence on American sources. During the 1920's the direction of change was not clearly established, but there was a growing concensus that the traditional recitation method of the past was no longer satisfactory. A speaker at the meetings of the Canadian Teachers Federation in 1921 anticipated this when he observed

> *Education is an indefinitely continued story. The last few years have shown wonderful changes in education, but we are still the victims of five centuries of verbalistic knowledge, the word, the book, the dogma. The time has come when education must be less of "knowing" and more of "doing". There must be a closer touch between the life the boy or girl is afterwards to lead and his school life.*[15]

The change in emphasis became apparent within the decade. In 1926 an inspector of schools in British Columbia noted that

> *The most encouraging feature of the year's work has been the evidence displayed of a trend towards the adoption of what is generally termed the movements of the "New Education." Our more advanced and progressive teachers are developing a modern technique of classroom procedure. The recitation is being socialized: school-work is being motivated....*[16]

In the Province of Alberta progressive education was enthusiastically received, so much so that the reforms introduced in 1936 and extended in 1940 were probably the most progressive of any in the country. One of the unique avenues open to American influence in this province was through private educational clubs formed in Edmonton and Calgary under the encouragement and leadership of the Supervisor of Schools, H. C. Newland. Under the names of the Edmonton Education Society and the Calgary Progress Club a group of teachers met regularly in these two cities to discuss major educational issues, problems and ideas. At first relatively little attention was paid to the literature and the ideas associated with progressive education. Because of the extensive coverage given to available literature on education, members did periodically review material directly related to progressive education. No attempt was made by members of the Edmonton Education Society to discriminate against foreign, including American, sources. In fact the Society was on the mailing list of the Department of the Interior and requently approached a problem utilizing a comparative approach. Once H. C. Newland returned from Chicago in 1932 having completed his Ph.D. degree there, the emphasis shifted. Works by Bode, Washburne, Counts, Thayer, Dewey, Rugg, Kilpatrick and Childs were reviewed and made available to the members. The members of the Calgary Progress Club grew in their appreciation for the new education and advocated that Alberta begin to utilize the educational methods and principles of such bodies as the Progressive Education Association and the New Education Fellowship insofar as might be considered wise.[17] In 1935 the Edmonton Education Society utilized the book and the title of the books, *The Social Foundations of Education* by George S. Counts as the theme for their year's discussions.[18] They directed a letter to Dr. Childs at Teachers College requesting a list of books associated with the theme.[19] On receipt of same a selection of books from the list was purchased as were two subscriptions to the *Social Frontier*.[20]

While there is evidence to suggest that material on the new education was readily available for professionals to consider, the majority of the teaching force was poorly informed about the new education.[21] Much of the interest in the new education was generated in the normal schools and the departments of education of the time. These were the people who were conscious of the need for educational reform and who generally bothered to keep abreast of contemporary developments. In addition to their study of professional literature in the periodicals and books of the time, these leaders furthered their own education by working toward university graduate degrees. Consistently, this was done in the leading universities of the United States.

Many Canadians chose to attend Teachers College, Columbia University. It has been estimated that "from 1923 to 1938 the total number of foreign students who enrolled in Teachers College was 3,852, drawn from 80 countries. Of these, 1097 came from Canada, 565 from China, 147 from England, 112 from Germany, 164 from Japan...."[22] Although other countries felt the impact of progressivism, none had a higher attendance of students at Teachers College than did Canada. Canadians in only one year 1923, between 1919 and 1945 failed to constitute the majority among the foreign students. Further, attendance of Canadian students was sustained across the time period, whereas the attendance of students from other countries was irregular (see Table I). While Teachers College was the major center for graduate study other leading American universities were attended by a large number of Canadian students. Chicago, California and Stanford were among the more frequently attended by Canadians. In addition to those on degree programs, large numbers attended American universities for summer session courses. Summer school enrollments of Canadians at Teachers College were similarly high. In the early 1930's as many as one hundred Canadians were in attendance[23] and for several summers the numbers were close to two hundred.[24]

TABLE I

Attendance of Canadians and Other Foreign Students
At Teachers College 1919-1945

Year	Number of Foreign Students	Total Number of Canadians	Number of Students of Next Most Populous Country – China
1919	120	39	32
1920	189	60	51

Year	Number of Foreign Students	Total Number of Canadians	Number of Students of Next Most Populous Country – China
1921	191	46	37
1922	227	67	46
1923	240	37	71
1924	225	72	37
1925	293	93	64
1926	269	69	52
1927	286	89	51
1928	329	97	50
1929	271	70	36
1930	281	80	41
1931	302	101	41
1932	231	64	33
1933	173	50	26
1934	135	50	15
1935	165	67	23
1936	177	73	26
1937	163	63	25
1938	169	66	31
1939	206	69	27
1940	185	55	20
1941	145	53	21
1942	186	35	21
1943	102	27	20
1944	89	27	17
1945	142	39	33

According to Sheane "the decade between 1920 and 1930 was characterized as a challenge to the recitation method.[25] Canadians as they considered alternatives looked to other countries for ideas. Special attention was paid to patented techniques developed in the United States. During this period of searching, many Canadians looked to Scandinavia and particularly to the folk high school because of what this school was credited with accomplishing in a rural country such as Denmark. The most conspicuous experimentation of the period was focussed on the Winnetka and Dalton Plans. These techniques were inspired by the work of Frederick Burk and established by and identified with Carleton Washburne and Helen Parkhurst. Almost without exception one of the first signs of interest in progressive education in Canada was an experimental program utilizing either the Dalton or the Winnetka approach. In most provinces the Dalton Plan was the more prominent of the two approaches. In British Columbia the Dalton Plan was tried in two schools in Victoria in 1924 and used for a couple of years. It was found that "a great deal of planning, individual help, oversight of pupils' work, and checking of results was necessary for the success of this method."[26] Alberta teachers undertook limited experimentation. The Winnetka Plan was studied and rejected due to its cost to operate. In 1924 the Dalton Plan was introduced for a five year trial at Garneau Public School in Edmonton. Once the teachers who used it either left the school or tired of the approach it was abandoned.[27] Leaders of the United Farm Women of Alberta gave additional impetus to the interest and application of the Dalton Plan. They saw the Dalton approach as a means of altering a system which was too rigid and too routine.

The Province of Saskatchewan examined the Winnetka technique more extensively than did any of the other Candian provinces. Indication of interest is found as early as 1926.[28] Experimental programs were underway in Saskatoon and Moose Jaw by 1928. One of the experiments was described as follows:

> *During the year a further extension of the work being done in classes conducted according to the Winnetka technique was made. Two classes of beginners and one Grade II — each consisting of about 32 children — were taught according to this method.... These teachers had previously attended a summer session at Winnetka to familiarize themselves with the methods of individualization of teaching as carried on under Dr. Carleton Washburne. In both schools where this technique is undertaken, children in rooms of corresponding grades are taught according to traditional methods....*

> *We have aimed to use the Winnetka methods and the Winnetka materials, and not any modification of either. This is the only way to give the technique a fair trial.*[29]

As additional understandings and appreciations were sought, Carleton Washburne was brought to Regina for the purpose of offering a one-week seminar on Winnetka.[30] Numerous teachers and administrators over a period of several years attended American summer schools dealing with Winnetka.

In Manitoba the Dalton Plan was used as early as 1925[31] in the Tache School in Norwood and as late as 1935 in the St. John's Technical School.[32] Nova Scotia utilized the Dalton Plan to cope with the demands for secondary education in small rural schools.

The first provincial revision along the lines of progressive education was introduced in Saskatchewan in 1931. By the mid 1940's all but one of the provinces had attempted a similar reform. In that same time span some of the provinces modified their initial reforms and extended the impact of progressive education. Two of these provincial reforms were important for the influential role they played in shaping later reforms in other provinces. In that the reform movement was spread over approximately a fifteen year period, the opportunity to imitate other Canadian reforms existed for some provinces. Dependence upon American practice was apparent, but the exchanges among Canadian provinces were much more prominent. Especially were the programs of Alberta and British Columbia of value as models. Also their education leaders served as consultants and authorities in other provinces.

The role played by American expertise and practice in the actual planning and formulation of the new programmes is difficult to assess. The similarities between the new Canadian programmes and the various courses of study in the United States leads one to conclude that the influence was significant. This view is substantiated in the few instances where insight into the work of the planners is available. In Alberta for instance the three member curriculum committee acknowledged an indebtedness to the Course of Study for Virginia Schools.[33] Their recommended reading lists also suggested that their revision was in the mainstream of American progressive educational thought. The textbook most frequently cited as a basic reference was Rugg and Shumaker's, *The Child-Centered School*. Use was also made of a list of reference texts which were obtained at Teachers College.

Of all the four phases associated with the introduction of progressive education in Canada, the one with the heaviest demands on American literature and personnel was the one following the introduction of the reforms. Unfortunately, the changes had been poorly anticipated. Teachers expressed an urgent need for help as soon as the new curriculum and methodology was upon them. The reforms had been the work of an educational elite who were now faced with the task of educating the teachers and popularizing the reform. Although Canadian educators produced numerous articles to aid teachers, the professional literature for teachers in Canada was filled with a large number of articles by such American authorities as Kilpatrick, Washburne, Bode and Dewey. Once the major changes were made in Alberta and British Columbia in 1936 a regular series of articles began to appear across the country on the new education.

Summer school attendance increased at overwhelming rates. In Alberta in the summer prior to the 1936 changes approximately one thousand teachers or roughly one sixth of the provincial teaching force attended summer school.[34] The heavy enrollments continued unabated for several years following the 1936 revision. In that there were relatively few well informed teachers who were familiar with the new education and in that many normal school instructors were away taking summer school themselves, it is not surprising to discover that a large number of instructors were recruited from the United States to offer instruction on the new programmes at summer school. For example in Alberta in 1937 Miss Mary Lothrop, principal of an elementary school in Los Angeles, divided her time between the summer schools at Calgary and Edmonton.[35] In 1938 five special instructors were appointed, all from American institutions.[36] The visitors were Lillian Gray from San Jose State College, Edna Reed from Fox Meadow Elementary School in Scarsdale, New York, Agnes Allardice from Queen's College in Flushing, New York, Tompsie Baxter from Lincoln School at Teachers College and Marion Cass from Glen Cove, New

York. The utilization of such instructors for summer schools continued into the early 1940's. One of these instructors, Miss Lillian Gray, is credited with extending her services to the point of providing a tentative course outline, which purportedly served as the basis of the 1940 revision of the Alberta program.[37] The imported specialists were practitioners and they emphasized methods of instruction in their course work. The call upon instructors from the United States was apparent in other provinces as well.

Another avenue of American influence on the new programme is found in the literature recommended to enhance the teachers' understanding of the innovations. In one British Columbia publication, twenty-two books were recommended reading. Every book listed was published in the United States. The pattern was the same in other provinces and it did not change appreciably over time as the Canadian market did not encourage the publication of Canadian materials. Only one Canadian book rivalled American sources for prominence.[38]

Conventions were also utilized to highlight the educational reforms of the period. While Canadian leaders of reform such as D. Dickie, H. C. Newland, and H. B. King were frequently called upon, invariably the keynote speaker was a leading American educator. Among those who came to Canada in such a role were Boyd Bode, Carson Ryan, George Counts, Frederick Redefer, E. T. McSwain and Carleton Washburne. The ultimate in this importation was achieved in Alberta in 1939 when nine members of the Progressive Education Association executive visited the Alberta teachers' convention. The event was described as follows:

> *The Easter Convention on April 10-13, 1939, was a unique event in the history of Canadian education. Through the joint effort and support of the Department of Education and the Alberta Teachers' Association a programme of outstanding excellence was offered, under the direction of the Progressive Education Association. Nine visiting speakers addressed sessions of the Convention, which by means of a double shift was held in the Macdonald Hotel and the McDougall Church, Edmonton. The general public was invited to all sessions, it being the desire of the speakers to arouse the interest of parents in the progressive movement.*

> *The following were the guest speakers:*
>
> *Dr. Frederick L. Redefer, Executive Secretary of the Progressive Education Association, 2221 W. 57 St., New York.*
>
> *Dr. Howard Lane, Professor of Education, Northwestern University, Chicago.*
>
> *Dr. Alice Keliher, Chairman of the Commission on Human Relations of the Progressive Education Association, and Instructor in New York University.*
>
> *Dr.Reginald Bell, Assistant Professor of Education, Leland Stanford University, California.*
>
> *Dr. Ralph W. Tyler, Dean of the School of Education, University of Chicago.*
>
> *Dr. Hilda Taba, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Chicago.*
>
> *Dr. Louis Heil, Associate Professor of Education, University of Chicago.*
>
> *Dr. Wilfred Eberhart, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Chicago.*
>
> *Dr. Maurice Hartung, Assistant Director of the Evaluation Staff of the Eight Year Study, Progressive Education Association, and member of the Board of Directors of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.*
>
> *It is likely to be a long time before such a galaxy of speakers is heard again at our Easter Convention. Officials representing the Department of Education in Manitoba and in Saskatchewan were visitors at the Convention. In fact, the whole affair was a grand success.*[39]

Interest in the Progressive Education Association grew in Canada during the 1930's and early 1940's. Educators in Canada had been somewhat dismayed to learn that their schools had not been described or discussed in the meetings of the New Education Fellowship in 1929.

When reviewing the report of the 1929 Conference, one Canadian noted

> *It is a significant circumstance, and perhaps not an entirely flattering one, that there is no reference in the volume to Canadian schools. There is not even a Section of the Fellowship in Canada.... Since Sections have already been established in about twenty different countries it would seem that Canada is not exactly a pioneer in the "New Education" movement (112).*[40]

Shortly after this, several branches of the New Education Fellowship were started in Canada. The most active section was in Toronto. This group encouraged cooperation with the Progressive Education Association.[41] They participated in meetings of the P.E.A. in the northern states and encouraged the joint sponsorship of similar meetings in Canada. The P.E.A. which was becoming more internationally minded at this point in time welcomed the opportunity of involvement in Canada. By 1938 active consideration was being given by the P.E.A. executive to a formal affiliation between the Canadian N.E.F. and P.E.A.[42] A Canadian committee and executive were appointed by the P.E.A.[43] Funds were acquired from the Carnegie Corporation and additional money provided by the P.E.A. to support the involvement of nine Canadian delegates at the 1941 Ann Arbor Conference of the New Education Fellowship and the P.E.A.[44] Joint conferences were sponsored in Canada at Windsor and Hamilton, Ontario in November 1938 and in Edmonton, Alberta in April 1939.[45] Approximately 3,500 educators attended the three meetings. Canadian membership in the P.E.A. in January 1940 totalled fifty-three after an earlier peak of one hundred and four in 1938.[46] Five Canadians were included on the Executive and General Conference Committees of the Ann Arbor New Education Fellowship.

Canadian acceptance of progressive education must be seen as a part of the larger American progressive education movement. Although the reforms were limited in comparison to those in the United States and although the reforms came later and were relatively short-lived, Canadian interest in progressive education clearly resulted from an extension of the American movement. By developing our understanding of progressive education in Canada we are adding a significant dimension to our understanding of progressive education in the United States. We also increase our understanding of some of the major avenues of American influence on Canadian education which continue to function today.

NOTES

1. Peter Sandiford, "Curriculum Revision in Canada," *The School*, February, 1938, pp. 475.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Ibid.*

4. P. E. Corbett, "Anti-Americanism," *Dalhousie Review*, Vol. 10, October, 1930, p. 297.

5. Letter from W. E. Hay to H. C. Newland, June 19, 1936, *Newland Papers*.

6. Sandiford, *op. cit.*, p. 477.

7. H. L. Campbell, *Curriculum Trends in Canadian Education*, Toronto: W. J. Gage & Co. Ltd., 1952, p. 49.

8. Cremin in describing progressive education in the United States commented that "progressive education began as Progressivism in education: a many-sided effort to use the schools to improve the lives of individuals." This assertion needs to be tested in a Canadian context. Superficially, at least, it has merit.

9. H. T. J. Coleman, *Report of the National Conference on Character Education in Relation to Canadian Citizenship*, Winnipeg, 1919, p. 128.

10. M. Sheridan, "The Promise in Canadian Secondary Education," *Educational Review*, April, 1925, p. 203.

11. C. E. Phillips, *Public Secondary Education in Canada*, Toronto: W. J. Gage & Co. Ltd., 1955, pp. 58-59.

12. Province of Alberta, *Report of the Legislative Committee on Rural Education*, 1935, p. 30.

13. Harold W. Foght, *A Survey of Education in the Province of Saskatchewan*, Regina: King's Printer, 1918.

14. J. H. Putman and G. M. Weir, *Survey of the School System of British Columbia*, Victoria: King's Printer, 1925, *passim*.

15. *A.T.A. Magazine*, Vol. II, No. 6, November, 1921, p. 24.

16. H. H. Mackenzie, Inspector in British Columbia, *Annual Report of the Department of Education*, 1926, p. R34.

17. *Proceedings of the Edmonton Education Society*, December 8, 1934.

18. *Ibid.*, October 12, 1935.

19. *Ibid.*, October 4, 1935.

20. *Ibid.*, November 23, 1935.

21. The author has surveyed teachers of the period in Alberta who generally indicated that they had little or no knowledge of the theory and practice of progressive education. This view is substantiated by the fact that the Department of Education was inundated with pleas for assistance once the new program was implemented.

22. W. W. Brickman, "William Heard Kilpatrick and International Education," *Education Theory*, Vol. XVI, No. 1, January, 1966, p. 20.

23. Columbia University, *Report of the Registrar*, 1931, p. 29.

24. *Ibid.*, 1939, p. 32.

25. G. K. Sheane, "The History and Development of the Elementary School in Alberta," Doctor of Pedagogy thesis, University of Toronto, 1948, p. 86.

26. British Columbia, *Public School Report*, 1924, p. 34.

27. C. E. Phillips, *The Development of Education in Canada*, Toronto: W. J. Gage & Co., Ltd., 1957, p. 464.

28. Province of Saskatchewan, *Annual Report of the Department of Education*, 1926, p. 101.

29. *Ibid.*, 1930, pp. 92-93.

30. *The School*, 1931, pp. 908-909.

31. Province of Manitoba, *Annual Report of the Department of Education*, 1925, p. 46.

32. *Ibid.*, 1935, p. 124.

33. Letter from H. C. Newland to Olive M. Fisher, May 23, 1936, *Newland Papers*.

34. H. C. Newland, "Alberta's New Programme for the Elementary School," *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Convention of the Canadian Education Association*, 1936, p. 68.

35. Province of Alberta, *Annual Report of the Department of Education*, 1937, p. 22.

36. *Ibid.* 1938, p. 34.

37. G. K. Sheane, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

38. This book was published in 1941. It was entitled, *The Enterprise in Theory and Practice* and was authored by Donalda Dickie, one of the three member Alberta 1936 revision committee.

39. Province of Alberta, *op. cit.*, 1939, pp. 38-39.

40. *A.T.A. Magazine*, Vol. XI, No. 6, February, 1931, p. 14.

41. *Minutes of the Executive Committee of the Progressive Education Association and the American Education Fellowship*. May 11, 1935.

42. *Ibid*., 1938, p. 3.

43. *Ibid*., October, 1939.

44. *Ibid*., September, 1940.

45. *Ibid*., December, 1939.

46. *Ibid*.

EDUCATION AND MULTILINGUALISM IN MANITOBA

by Keith Wilson
Assistant Dean of Education
University of Manitoba

The purpose of this paper is to examine historically some aspects of the relationship of language differences to the educational development of the province of Manitoba. The topic is signigicant not only because language differences, and the ethnic and cultural differences they represent, still present problems for the school system of Manitoba, and also because in the total Canadian context, the quest for bilingualism and biculturalism has emerged as a basic problem of Canadian unity. The educational history of Manitoba, a province which began as an English-French duality but which became through immigration an ethnic mosaic, represents a unique example of the effects on education of language multiplicity.

The permanent settlement of what is now the province of Manitoba began with the colonizing ideas of the Earl of Selkirk, a pioneer in thinking of emigration as a remedy for economic distress. In 1811, he purchased a controlling interest in the Hudson's Bay Company and received a grant of land which centred on the Red River and which included parts of the present provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario, and of the states of Minnesota and North Dakota. This land grant was to be known as Assiniboia, and into this area, inhabited by the native Indians, the agents of the rival fur trading companies, and the Métis, came parties of settlers from the distressed areas of Scotland and Ireland.

After early vicissitudes, the settlement was placed on a firm footing by the personal intervention of Selkirk in 1817. It is, perhaps, of passing interest to note that his plans for the early schools of the settlement he apparently had in mind the use of Gaelic as the language of instruction:

> *Arithmetic with reading and writing in their native tongue are the branches to be first attended to and I care not how little the children are taught of the language of the Yankies.*[1]

His plan came to nothing, and other attempts at providing schools were short lived and ineffective until the arrival of Roman Catholic missionaries from Quebec in 1818 and of the first Anglican clergyman in 1820.

The union of the rival fur trading companies in 1821 brought the prospect of peace to the settlement which gradually flourished in relative isolation from the rest of the world. Control of the settlement reverted to the Hudson's Bay Company in 1834, but the settlement continued to progress and to develop some of the attributes of a civilized society. Opportunities for schooling were gradually extended through the efforts of the Roman Catholic, Anglican, and, later, the Presbyterian churches; education remained almost the exclusive preserve of the churches until confederation.

By mid-century the settlement contained many elements: Scottish, English, French and Metis in addition to the Indians. Relationships between these various groups were good, and in essence the Red River settlement was an English-speaking Protestant -- French-speaking Catholic duality. But the old isolation was gradually breaking down. The establishment of an overland trade route to St. Paul, the advent of regular mail services and the appearance of a locally published newspaper all combined to open the settlement to both eastern Canadian and American influence at the very time that ideas of Canadian confederation were being seriously discussed.

The last few years of Company rule were politically turbulent. New settlers from the east favoured union with the new Dominion; others favoured annexation by the United States; a few even favoured Crown Colony status. Moreover, the continual trickle of immigration and the gradual advance of agricultural settlement disturbed the Indians and Metis who feared the end of their accustomed way of life. This fear was expressed in the insurrection of 1869-70 led by Louis Riel, the Métis leader.

Despite the outcry from Protestant Canada occasioned by Riel's murder of the Orangeman, Thomas Scott, the terms of the Manitoba Act, by which the new province was brought into confederation, were dictated largely by Riel. The French-Catholic schools, which has been assiduously built into a system by the bishops of St. Boniface, were to be safeguarded. In Clause 22, the Manitoba Act provided that the provincial legislature should have the exclusive right to make laws relating to education, but this right was subject to several conditions. The most significant of these conditions was contained in section (1) of the same clause. It read:

> *Nothing in any such Law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to Denominational Schools which any class of persons have by Law or practice in the Province at the Union.*[2]

This clause, based on Clause 93 of the British North America Act of 1867, differed only in the addition of the two words **or practice**, and thus specifically safeguarded the denominational schools which, of necessity, could not exist by law. The last two sections of the clause provided for an appeal to the federal cabinet where the educational rights or privileges of a group had been adversely affected, and for the enactment of remedial legislation, where necessary, by the federal parliament.

In 1870 the new province was still fairly evenly divided between French-speaking Catholics and English-speaking Protestants,[3] and it was on the basis of religion that the new school system was established. The dual education system, under church control, was closely modelled on that of Quebec. Public funds were to be used for the support of separate, denominational schools, and these funds were to be provided equally to the Catholic and Protestant sections of the newly constituted Board of Education. Each section of the Board was to have a Superintendent and through him would control its own schools in cooperation with locally elected boards of trustees. Manitoba, then, began with a dual system of education: French Catholic and English Protestant.

The population of Manitoba, however, soon changed. Into the lands of the west the Dominion government freely invited immigration from the old world, and in the decades that followed, this immigration combined with that from the older provinces of the Dominion to change radically the ethnic and religious pattern of the province.

From 1870 to 1874 the main immigration was from Ontario, but the latter year saw the beginning of a new era with the formation of the first Mennonite reserve, to which a second was added in 1876. The year 1875 saw the formation of an Icelandic colony just north of the provincial boundary on the shores of Lake Winnipeg. Both these groups had received assurances of special rights and privileges from the federal government: the Mennonites were granted exemption from military service and the privilege of exercising their religious and educational principles; the Icelanders were granted immediate citizenship and the right to preserve their language. Morton, the foremost historian of Manitoba, summarized the situation in 1875 thus:

> *By 1875, then, Manitoba had not quite taken leave of the old order, or quite entered on the new. But immigration had brought about two fundamental changes in Manitoba: the equality of English and French, Protestant and Catholic, had been upset in favour of the English and Protestant, and the principle of duality in language and education brought into jeopardy. The establishment of the Mennonite and Icelandic colonies had transformed the ethnic pattern from a bilingual to a multilingual one, with consequences not to be felt for another generation.*[4]

Significant changes occurred in the economic, social and political structure of the province during the next two decades. The completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway main line across the province led to a land boom and stimulated further settlement, and the provincial struggle against the C.P.R. monopoly led to the development of political parties in the modern sense and to the emergence of the Liberal party under Thomas Greenway. The election of 1888, which returned only six French speaking members to a legislature of thirty-eight seats, marked the truimph of Ontario over Quebec in Manitoba.

Later in 1888 the passage of the Jesuits' Estates Act in the province of Quebec triggered off a wave of anti-papal, anti-Catholic and anti-French feeling in Ontario and southwestern Manitoba where the Orange Lodges had considerable influence. In Manitoba, this led to the demand for the abolition of the dual system of schools and of the official status of the French language. The session of the legislature in 1890 saw the passage of a bill to abolish the official use of the French language in the province and of a bill to change the school system. The passage of this latter bill, which provided for a system of non-denominational schools administered by local boards, and for a department of education with a minister responsible to the legislature, began six years of acute controversy, known as the Manitoba Schools Question, which only partly subsided in 1896 when a compromise was reached between the federal and provincial governments.

It is important to note that this long controversy was fought mainly on the religious issue, but that the language question was also evident. In the public mind the terms 'French' and 'Roman Catholic' were closely identified, and the attack on the dual system in 1890 was levelled partly against Roman Catholicism and partly against the French language. The spirit of the Legislature was decidedly anti-French, and when three French members, in presenting petitions, spoke in French, this was reported as "an unusual occurrence, which, under the circumstances, excited considerable laughter in the House".[5]

These attacks on the French and the French language inevitably provoked much support for the French Catholic cause from the province of Quebec. As the controversy raged, and as the question was fought through the courts and eventually brought into the federal political arena, the issues became blurred by questions of provincial rights.

After the provincial election of 1896, which confirmed the Liberals in office, the school issue was used jointly by the federal and provincial Liberals as a weapon against the federal Conservative government which had initiated remedial legislation. The issue, then, became primarily a political issue, and the level of debate sank to vituperation. Typical of this was the editorial in the **Winnipeg Tribune** commenting on the stand taken by Mr. Daly, a Winnipeg member of the federal cabinet.

> *And now we have Mr. Daly, our representative in the Cabinet, wholly ignoring the verdict of the people of Manitoba in the school question last week, standing up in Pariament and traitorously accusing us for not yielding meekly to the bidding of the Quebec hierarchy, and restoring separate schools in the province.*
>
> *...He would be dangerous where it not for the fact that he is an intellectual imbecile, so thoroughly discredited in this country that it makes little difference what he may say, or what side he may take in parliament.*[6]

The school question, in fact, was largely responsible for breaking the federal Conservative party and for bringing the federal Liberals to office. The Laurier-Greenway Compromise followed shortly thereafter.

As agreed in this compromise, Premier Greenway introduced provincial legislation in the following year to provide for religious teaching under certain conditions in the public schools. The question of language was settled in Clause 10 which stated:

> *Where ten of the pupils in any school speak the French language, (or any language other than English) as their native language, the teaching of such pupils shall be conducted in French (or other such language), and English upon the bilingual system.*[7]

The careless wording of this clause proved to be unfortunate in the extreme. The intention was simply to preserve the right of the French to their own language in the schools in which they were in a majority; and the possibilities under this clause of saddling the province with a multilingual system of schools were not realized at the time. It is probable that the negotiators expected that the privileges contained in this clause would be claimed only by the French, but that the clause was made inclusive to forestall criticism against Laurier for claiming, and against Sifton, representing the provincial government, for conceding, special privileges to the French.[8] This clause, which had a further weakness in its failure to define precisely the phrase "upon the bilingual system", nevertheless dictated the main characteristic of the school system of Manitoba from 1897 to 1916. Language, rather than religion, was to be the main divisive force in education.

This legislation became law at a time when the ethnic composition of the province was again changing. During the first half of the decade 1890 - 1900, there was a slackening of immigration caused partly by low wheat prices, tight capital, and a consequence pause in railway construction, but in 1896, rising wheat prices ushered in a period of prosperity which persisted until 1912 and completely transformed the province. Settlement rapidly spread throughout the province, and Slavic peoples from central and eastern Europe began to migrate to Manitoba, encouraged by the immigration policies of Clifford Sifton, the federal Minister of the Interior.

The arrival of the new immigrants from both western and eastern Europe drastically altered the ethnic composition of the province and tended to blur the former close identity of religion and language. For example, where previously the terms 'French' and 'Roman Catholic' had been vitually synonymous, this was no longer the case. Most French-Canadians, indeed, were still Roman Catholic, but by no means all Roman Catholics were French. What had been essentially a religious problem gradually evolved into an ethnic or linguistic problem. The intransigence of Archbishop Langevin of St. Boniface who could declare to his parishioners:

> *Sauver le francais, c'est sauver une grande force catholique: l'anglais dans notre pays est une force pour l'héresis.*[9]

only served to cause further dissension between French speaking and English speaking Catholics and to stress the ethnic and linguistic rather than the religious issues.

The bilingual clause stood ready for use or abuse by the many ethnic groups, and in fact the number of bilingual schools increased steadily throughout this period, as not only the French but also the German speaking Mennonites, the Poles and the Ukrainians invoked the bilingual clause. It is interesting to note, however, that no attempt was ever made to establish Swedish, Hungarian or Icelandic bilingual schools despite the presence in the province of settlements of these ethnic groups.

By 1915, there were in operation 126 French bilingual schools employing 234 teachers, having an enrolment of 7393 pupils and an average attendance of 2165 for the year; 61 German bilingual schools employing 73 teachers, having an enrolment of 2814 pupils and an average attendance of 1840; and 111 Polish and Ruthenian bilingual schools with 114 teachers, an enrolment of 6513 and an average attendance for the year of 3885.[10] It should be noted that the comparatively low average attendance rate in these schools was not appreciably different from that of the province as a whole. Compulsory school attendance legislation had yet to be enacted.

The era of the bilingual public school system came to an end in 1916 when the newly elected Liberal government of T. C. Norris enacted legislation which repealed the bilingual clause and, with the School Attendance Act, brought Manitoba the dubious distinction of being the last Canadian province to enact compulsory school attendance.

From 1897 to 1916, then, education in Manitoba was operated under the terms of the bilingual clause. The effects of this on the development of education were of both immediate and of lasting significance.

The most significant immediate effect was that the operation of the bilingual clause gave expression in the school system to the divisive forces already present in the ethnic settlement pattern of the province. As Sissons pointed out, if the newly arriving immigrants from central and eastern Europe settled in solid colonies, there would in any case be the problem of bringing the English language and Canadian ideals into their schools, while if they settled among established communities there would be the added problem of a multiplicity of languages in a single school, each language contending for the privilege of being associated with English "upon the bilingual system".[11] These problems were increased by the attempts of some clergy and nationalist agitators to abuse the bilingual system for their own ends.[12]

In fact, the bilingual clause acted as a means by which the ethnic diversity of the province militated against educational progress, for a literal and legal interpretation of the bilingual clause could with absurd ease produce chaos, particularly in the rural schools. Typical of such a situation was that which occurred in the school district of Highland where, it was reported:

> *In January, 1914, a number of ratepayers in the school district of Highland No. 1628, petitioned the trustees to employ a bilingual teacher speaking Polish and English. In May, 1914, a petition was presented to the same School Board asking for the employment of a teacher who*

> *could speak Gaelic and English. The trustees have, so far, been unable to find a teacher speaking Gaelic, Polish and English, and have continued to operate the school as a straight English school.*[13]

The incident surely speaks for itself.

The very existence of such a diversified ethnic pattern in the province led inevitably to the slow crystallization of a conscious nationalism. The extent of diversity became in time a factor for unification and assimilation, but the continued operation of the bilingual clause tended to perpetuate ethnic differences. With the advent of the First World War in 1914, the growing concern with the political dangers inherent in a society so ethnically diverse was reinforced by a wave of patriotic fervour which largely contributed to the abolition of the bilingual system in 1916.

The potential value of the schools in Canadianizing new immigrants also became an argument not only for the enactment of compulsory school attendance legislation, but also for the abolition of the bilingual system, for it was argued that the teaching of English, a basis for effective Canadian citizenship, had suffered badly under the bilingual system. This was borne out by the work of a Winnipeg principal, W. J. Sisler, who proved beyond reasonable doubt that the most effective way to teach English to the immigrants from central and eastern Europe was by the use of the direct method of language instruction.[14]

The operation of the bilingual clause also accentuaged the general teacher shortage and brought an additional and unique problem. In the non-English speaking areas there was the difficulty, not only of attracting teachers, but also of securing teachers capable of teaching in both their own language and in English. In practice, this meant that in a Ukrainian settlement, for example, the teacher had to be Ukrainian, and yet for many years there were practically no qualified Ukrainian teachers.

It soon became obvious that the only way to staff the bilingual schools was by training the new immigrants as teachers for their home areas. Inevitably, then, the bilingual system of schools led to the establishment of a bilingual system of teacher training, and facilities were soon provided.

Continuously from 1897, facilities for the training of French teachers were available at St. Boniface, but the number of prospective teachers was never adequate to meet the demand and a lowering of standards was frankly admitted.[15] Training facilities for the Mennonites were also provided, but here also, there was a continuing shortage of prospective teachers.

By 1897, both the French and the Mennonites had been established in Manitoba for some years; and while they both faced problems of teacher shortages, their problems were far less acute than those faced by the Ukrainians, or as they were then called, the Galicians or Ruthenians. Not only were the Ukrainians recent immigrants, but they were mainly of peasant stock, ignorant and despised. Very few educated Ukrainians had entered Manitoba. Some individuals were sufficiently educated to be granted teaching permits, but a better solution had to be found. Thus, in 1905, the provincial Department of Education established the Ruthenian Training School for prospective male teachers of Ukrainian and Polish origin.[16] Two years later the Ukrainian and Polish sections were separated, and there was some suspicion that the exclusively Ukrainian training school had become a centre for Ukrainian nationalist agitation.[17] It may certainly be claimed that the existence of the various bilingual training institutions represented a further divisive influence in provincial society.

As has been seen, by 1915, about one child in six enrolled in the public schools of Manitoba was enrolled in a bilingual school, and the rural school system particularly was badly fragmented by the operation of the bilingual clause. In these bilingual schools generally, the children received a scant training in English from teachers who frequently could speak little English and had little understanding of Canadian society or Canadian ideals. This fact, combined with the lack of compulsory school attendance legislation, brought notoriety to Manitoba as an illiterate province. Sissons commented:

> *The illiteracy of Manitoba became a byword throughout Canada, and after the visit of Hon. Herbert Samuel in 1913, even across the Atlantic. Mr. Samuel, it will be remembered, ventured to say at Montreal, in reference to the educational situation in Manitoba: "I cannot refrain from expressing pain that in one of the largest and most progressive provinces of the Dominion I should find a state of things existing almost a generation behind the rest of the civilized world", and was called for his pains by the Premier of the Province "a jelly-bag of an Englishman".*[18]

The immediate effects of the operation of the bilingual clause were, then, the encouragement given to the divisive forces present in society; a retardation of educational progress; a potentiality for near chaos in the administration of education, especially in the rural areas; an added teacher shortage with the consequent extension of the bilingual principle beyond the schools to the teacher training institutions, and a failure to teach English effectively. At the same time the very extent of diversity gradually produced a reaction which led to a growing demand for the inculcation of Canadian ideals.

The lasting effects of the bilingual system were also significant. The repeal of the bilingual clause in 1916 understandably provoked a bitter reaction from the French whose language, as a language of instruction, had been abolished along with German, Polish and Ukrainian. This reaction was especially bitter as Canada was at that time in the midst of a war in which she was allied with France as well as Britain. It was claimed that Premier Norris had guaranteed in writing that the Laurier-Greenway compromise would be maintained unimpaired, and the repeal of the bilingual clause brought from the French-Canadian Vigilance Committee a protest which began with the following bitter comment:

> *Whereas Great Britain and the British Empire are at war today for the upholding of Great Britain's signature to a treaty; whereas a treaty signed and executed in Canada should not anymore be a scrap of paper than it is in Europe, unless there are two codes of honour...*[19]

But the abolition of the bilingual system did not become immediately effective in practice, for not surprisingly in schools where the majority was not English-speaking there was a tendency to give way to the wishes of the parents and to give instruction in the mother tongue.[20] This tendency continued in the French-speaking areas long after the language question had ceased to be a real problem in most other areas.[21]

According to the strict letter of the law, however, after 1916 no instruction in the public schools could be given in the French language or, indeed, in any language other than English; although St. Boniface College, a constituent college of the University of Manitoba, had always retained its right to provide instruction in the French language. This latter fact was turned to advantage in 1930 by a French delegation to the Minister of Education, when it was reasonably argued that students who were denied instruction in the French language in the public schools would necessarily be ill prepared for higher studies at St. Boniface College. As a result, an optional course in the French language was made available in grades 7 to 12. This course, which was to be taught by the direct method of language teaching and was designed as an enriched French course, was theoretically made available also to students whose mother tongue was other than French. These stipulations made changes in the legislation of 1916 unnecessary, while the unobtrusive manner in which the course was initiated forestalled any widespread opposition. In 1955, this French optional course was extended into grades 4, 5 and 6; and in 1963 it became available in all grade levels.

Not until 1967 was any official recognition extended to French as a language of instruction in the public schools; but in that year the Public Schools Act was amended to permit the more extensive use of French. Clause 240 Section (3), was amended to read:

> *Subject as herein provided, the French language, being one of the two languages to which reference is made in the* British North America Act, *1867, may be used in the public schools as a language of instruction.*[22]

The Minister of Education was empowered to permit, on application, the use of French as a language of instruction for any school subject, provided that the total time in which it was used did not exceed one half of the instructional time in any day.[23] In practice, programmes of study became available in Francais, a course in French Language and Literature, and in Sciences Sociales, a course which parallels the history and geography courses given in the English language. In the school year 1968-69, a total of 11,058 students were enrolled in the Francais courses, and 4,403 in the Sciences Sociales, which at the time was not available at all grade levels.

This then, was the situation in Manitoba in 1969. But it may well be asked why the recognition of French came so slowly. There are five basic reasons for this, not all of which can be readily documented.

(1) There was still a close identification in the popular mind of 'French' and 'Roman Catholic'. This anti-Catholicism was especially strong in western Manitoba where the Orange Lodges had traditionally been strong and where the population was largely Anglo-Saxon. Moreover, the over-representation of the rural areas in the legislature made the government hesitate to take any action that might involve religious issues.

(2) The French in Manitoba formed a comparatively small minority group. According to the census figures of

1931, 1941 and 1951, the French were outnumbered by both the British and Ukrainian groups, and by 1961, also by the Germans. Moreover, in 1931, they formed a mere 6% of the total population, and by 1961 only 9%. As the French were mainly settled in the rural areas of the province they tended to lack an elite lay leadership which could speak and act on their behalf. Not until the formation in 1968 of the Societe Franco-Manitobaine, with its Directorat de l'Education, did Franco-Manitobans have a strong voice to present their views.

(3) The retention of English as the sole language of instruction received considerable support from the younger members of other non-English speaking groups. To the young Mennonite or Ukrainian breaking away from the rigid mores of the prior generation, the English language was the key to future success.

(4) There was a very real fear of a possible return to the near chaos of the bilingual system. The legislation of 1916 had been a reaction, or an over-reaction, to the potential chaos of the bilingual system: and in this reaction all divisiveness was suspect. French, then, suffered along with Ukrainian, German and Polish. The lingering fear that "concessions" to the French language would lead to demands for similar concessions to other languages, was, moreover, strengthened by the attitude of other groups, especially the Ukrainians. The intemperate tone of some of the briefs presented to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism seems to indicate that fears of a relapse into multilingualism might still be very real even at this late date. Of all groups, the Ukrainians have been the most vocal both in their demands for recognition of their own language, which was introduced into the high school curriculum on an elective basis in 1962,[24] and in their antagonism to the extension of the use of the French language.

In January, 1964, a brief presented to the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism by the Curatorium of Ukrainian Catholic Schools called for Ukrainian as a language of instruction in areas with a high concentration of Ukrainians, and further defined the Ukrainian concept of bilingualism:

> *Bilingualism, to a Canadian with a mother tongue other than English or French, means the use of the mother tongue plus the dominant language of the respective province...placing their mother tongue...in first place.*[25]

A brief submitted in the following year, referred to the French Canadian demands for the same language and culture rights as the English in every province as "completely unrealistic" in so far as the French speaking Canadians did not constitute the second largest group in any of the four western Canadian provinces.[26] A further brief from the National Ukrainian Canadian Committee to Premier Weir of Manitoba in December, 1968, asked specificially that "minority languages be taught from the Grade I level and be used in the instruction of social studies and history".[27]

These varied demands almost certainly do not represent the attitudes of the average Ukrainian-Canadian in Manitoba; nor have they been treated as such by the government. They are best interpreted as expressions of fear for the future of Ukrainian culture, and, with the exception of the introduction of Ukrainian language courses in high school and university on an optional basis, they have met with no success.

(5) The final reason for the slow recognition of French as a language of instruction is well-known in Manitoba

> but difficult to document. It is simply that for many years the schools in the rural French areas did in fact use French as the language of instruction in flagrant disregard for the law. This has for many years been known to the Department of Education and has been freely admitted by teachers in these communities who now assert that their students cared more for the French language when its use was illegal than they do now.

In conclusion, it may be said that the future of the French language in Manitoba is secure, for it received a tremendous impetus from the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. This Commission recommended the establishment of bilingual districts where there is a French-speaking population of at least 10%, and that public education be provided in each of the official minority languages at both the elementary and secondary levels in the bilingual districts. The provincial legislation of 1967, already referred to, went part of the way to accommodate the recommendation. The debate on the Official Languages Bill in the federal pariament in 1969 again brought to the fore many of the fears and doubts of the minority ethnic groups who feared that the Bill would render them second-rate citizens. Edward Schreyer, the Leader of the New Democratic Party in Manitoba, firmly supported the proposed federal legislation, and it is significant that in the ensuring provincial election his party carried all the main ethnic constituencies.[28]

The Official Languages Act of July, 1969, declared English and French to be the official languages of the government of Canada and guaranteed that, where necessary, federal services would be provided in both languages. The application of the Act in areas which constitutionally lie within provincial jurisdiction rests with the individual provincial governments. In Manitoba this led to a further extension of French as a language of instruction in the schools and teacher education institutions.

Under the New Democratic Party government, the Public Schools Act was further amended by Bill 113 (1970) which clearly stated that "English and French being the two languages to which reference is made in the British North American Act, 1867, are the languages of instruction in public schools."[29]

The conditions governing the use of English and French as languages of instruction were also clearly stipulated:-

"Where there are in any school district, school division or school area

> (a) twenty-eight or more pupils in an elementary grade who may be grouped in a class for instruction; or
>
> (b) twenty-three or more pupils in a secondary grade who may be grouped in a class for instruction;
>
> *and whose parents desire them to be instructed in a class in which English or French, as the case may be, is used as the language of instruction, the board of the school district, school division or school area may, and upon petition of the parents of those pupils requesting the use of English or French, as the case may be, as the language of instruction in respect of those pupils, shall group those pupils in a class for instruction and provide for the use of English or French, as the case may be, as the language of instruction in the class."*

Advantage was soon taken of this new legislation, and at the beginning of the school year in September, 1972, there were forty elementary and seventeen secondary schools offering instruction wholly or partially in the French language.

This rapid development of French language schools inevitably led to increased attention to French language teacher education, and accordingly L'Institut Pedagogique, College de St. Boniface, was established in 1972 with both federal and provincial support. Although there had previously existed a French section at the

Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, political considerations at both the federal and provincial levels dictated that French language teacher education be located at St. Boniface.

Thus, in education, Manitoba has again become an English-French duality after a long, unique, and at times bitter, struggle.

NOTES

1. E. H. Oliver (ed.), *The Canadian North-West* (Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau, 1914), pp. 52-53.

2. *Statues of Canada*, 1870, Chapter 3.

3. K. Wilson, "The Development of Education in Manitoba" (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State University, 1967), p. 28.

4. W. L. Morton, *Manitoba: A History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), p. 174.

5. *Manitoba Free Press*, February 4, 1890.

6. *Winnipeg Tribune*, January 23, 1896.

7. *Statutes of Manitoba*, 1897, Chapter 26.

8. J. W. Dafoe, *Clifford Sifton in Relation to His Times* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1931), p. 98.

9. Cited by G. R. Cook, "Church, Schools, and Politics in Manitoba, 1903-12", *Canadian Historical Review*, Vol. XXXIX No. 1, March, 1958, p. 3.

10. Department of Education, *Special Report on Bilingual Schools in Manitoba*, 1916, pp. 5-17.

11. C. B. Sissons, Bilingual Schools in Canada (Toronto: Dent, 1917), pp. 118-119.

12. Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 286-7.

13. R. S. Thornton, *Bilingual Schools* Address in the Legislature, 1916.

14. W. J. Sisler, *Peaceful Invasion* (Winnipeg: n.p., 1944), pp. 31-32.

15. *Report of the Department of Education*, 1901, pp. 535-6.

16. *Report of the Department of Education*, 1908, p. 182.

17. Sissons, *op. cit.*, p. 125

18. *Ibid.*, p. 120.

19. *Telegram*, February 24, 1916.

20. *Report of the Department of Education*, 1918, p. 87.

21. *Report of the Department of Education*, 1934, p. 62.

22. *Statutes of Manitoba*, 1967, Chapter 49.

23. *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

24. *Report of the Department of Education*, 1962, pp. 43-44.

25. *Winnipeg Free Press*, January 31, 1964.

26. *Winnipeg Free Press*, May 20, 1965.

27. *Winnipeg Tribune*, December 10, 1968.

28. *Winnipeg Free Press*, July 18, 1969.

29. *En. Statutes of Manitoba*, 1970, Chapter 66.

30. *Ibid.* The Minister was also given discretionary power to enforce this regulation even when the numerical requirements were not met.

PART II

The 1972 Annual Meeting Midwest History of Education Society

Friday and Saturday October 27 – 28

Loyola University of Chicago, Regis Room, Marquette Center, 820
North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois

Afternoon Session Friday, October 27, 1972

2:00 3:00 Registration, Coffee Hour, Book and Slide Display

3:00 5:00 p.m.

Chairman	Adelia M. Peters, Program Chairman Midwest History of Education Society
Speaker	George M. Woytanowitz Department of Education Indiana State University
Topic	"University Extension in the United States, 1885-1915"*
Speaker	Kay H. Kamin, Department of Education Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois
Topic	"She Could Always Teach"*

*This address is published in Part I of this edition of the journal.

Evening Session Friday, October 27, 1972

5:00 6:00 Social Hour at the Tip Top Tap Room, Allerton Hotel

6:00 7:00 Dinner at the Allerton's Cloud Room

7:00 p.m.	After-dinner presentations and discussions
Chairman	W. Richard Stephens, President Midwest History of Education Society
Welcome	John Wosniak, Dean School of Education, Loyola University
Speaker	Robert E. Mason, Department of Education University of Southern Illinois, Edwardsville
Topic	"The Revolutions of 1968: A Neo-Hegelian View"*
Speaker	Vincent P. Lannie, Department of Education Notre Dame University South Bend, Indiana
Topic	"A Great Deal of Education Seed in You:" Henry Barnard and American Education

*This address is published in Part I of this edition of the journal.

Morning Session Saturday, October 28, 1972

9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

Chairman	Helen A. Archibald, Secretary Midwest History of Education Society
Speaker	Sheldon S. Cohen, Department of History Loyola University
Topic	"Cremin's **American Education**: Advantages and Limitations in History of American Education Courses"*
Speaker	David B. Ripley Department of Education Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois

Topic "Bronson Alcott: Transcendental Educator"*

*This address is published in Part I of this edition of the journal.

BUSINESS MEETING AND ELECTION OF NEW OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY

11:00 12:00 a.m. W. Richard Stephens, presiding

President Stephens asked Ed Rutkowski to give an explanation of the plans for an annual journal of proceedings for the society. Ed Rutkowski responded by stating that he had assurances from the University of Northern Iowa to use the physical facilities, clerical personnel, and graphics staff for publishing a journal. Vice President and provost of the University, James Martin had also agreed to give some modest financial assistance to the venture. As a result, it is hoped that the first edition of our journal would be printed by the end of January. Many questions were asked about the content and the format of the publication. It was explained that it was hoped that library subscriptions for the new journal could cover the cost of publishing and that each member in attendance at the annual meeting would receive a free copy.

President Stephens moved for a vote of thanks for Ed Rutkowski. A vote of confidence and approval was unanimously given by the membership.

Election of Officers:

The business of the meeting moved to the election of officers. As dictated by the long established tradition of the society, and in recognition for her fine program, Adelia M. Peters, Kent State University, was unanimously voted president of the society for the coming year.

Frank Nelson, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, was unanimously elected program chairman and vice president for the coming year. Helen Archibald, University of Indiana-South Bend, was unanimously elected secretary of the society for the coming year.